DUKE
UNIVERSITY

LIBRARY

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2014

https://archive.org/details/methodistarmorre00foot_0

THE METHODIST ARMOR REVIEWED.

THE RISE AND PROGRESS OF THE BAPTISTS,

—AND—

OUTLINES OF HISTORY

OF THE

BRIER-CREEK-ASSOCIATION.

By JAMES H. FOOTE,

DELLAPLANE, N. C.

"*He taketh from him all his Armor, wherein he trusted.*"—LUKE XI, 22.
"*I praise you, that ye keep the ordinances as I delivered them to you.*"
[I COR. XI, 2.

STATESVILLE, N. C.:
LANDMARK POWER PRESSES.
1888.

Sch. R.
286
F688M

TO THE

CHURCH OF CHRIST

AND

ESPECIALLY TO THE BRETHREN

OF THE

BRIER CREEK ASSOCIATION,

THIS LITTLE VOLUME

IS

RESPECTFULLY DEDICATED

BY THE AUTHOR.

384880

[Extract from Minutes of Brier Creek Baptist Association, held at Swan Creek Church, Yadkin County, September 22-24, 1887.]

The following paper was read and adopted by the Association:

WHEREAS, We have learned that Bro. J. H. Foote of our Association has written a reply to a book called "The Methodist Armor," written by H. T. Hudson, D. D., of the North Carolina Methodist Conference, in which work our principles as Baptists are assailed, therefore,

Resolved, That a committee of three members of this body be appointed to examine Bro. Foote's manuscript as to the advisability of encouraging the same for publication.

L. P. Gwaltney, T. W. Paris and D. W. Pool were appointed a committee.

The Committee reported as follows:

The Committee appointed to examine the manuscript of Bro. Foote do respectfully and earnestly recommend its immediate publication.

L. P. GWALTNEY.
T. W. PARIS.
D. W. POOL.

Report adopted.

To the Reader.

—o—

Some friend has handed us a very neat little book entitled:

"THE METHODIST ARMOR,
BY
Hilary T. Hudson, D. D.,
OF THE
North Carolina Conference,"

which we see is very generally circulated among our Methodist friends in this section of the country and commended for its many excellencies.

We propose to review briefly some portions of this volume. It is not from a fondness of controversy, but a desire to vindicate the honor of Christ, and his ordinances as practiced by the Baptists, from charges of an odious kind, that excited the author to compose and publish the following pages. The writer takes up his pen entirely on the defensive, for had not the principles and practice of Baptists been stigmatized as "*indecent and narrow-hearted bigotry*," these pages would have never seen the light. For instance, on page 81 of the above named book, the following language is used: "*It is satisfactory to discover that all attempts to impose upon Christians a practice (immersion) repulsive to the feelings, dangerous to the health and offensive to delicacy, is destitute of all scriptural authority and really of primitive practice.*" Again, on page 93 of his book, Dr. Hudson says: "*Baptism by pouring comports with decency and propriety, but does immersion?*" A little further on the Dr. says, speaking of the Baptists: "And to exclude pious Christians from the

Lord's table because they have not been immersed, *is narrow-hearted bigotry.*"

Again, on page 227 of his book, the Dr. says: "As Luther and his followers had a right to organize the Lutheran Church, and as John Calvin and Knox had a right to organize the Presbyterian Church, and as Bishop Crannon and Henry VIII had a right to organize the Episcopal Church in England, and *Roger Williams and his brethren had a right to organize the Baptist Church;* so had Mr. Wesley, Coke and Asbury a right to organize the Methodist Church."

Now the reader will see from the above quotations, if he be a Baptist, he is charged with practicing an *indecent* and *dangerous ordinance*, and that his Church was first organized by *Roger Williams!* while he has always been taught and believed that Jesus Christ alone is the author and founder of the Baptist Church.

"Good friends, sweet friends, let me not stir you up
To such a sudden flood of mutiny,
They that have done this deed are honorable;
What private griefs they have, alas I know not,
That made them do it. They are wise and honorable
And will no doubt with reason answer you.
I come not friends to steal away your hearts;
I am no orator as BRUTUS is,
But as you know me all, *a plain, blunt man,*
That love my friends, and that they know full well
That gave me public leave to speak of him;
For I have neither wit nor worth nor words,
Action nor utterance, nor the power of speech
To stir men's blood *I only speak right on.*"

Preface.

—o—

The matter contained in this little book contains no originality except an attempt to collect and combine extracts from various authors and present them in as plain and simple a manner as possible, so as to make it readable to the unlearned, as well as to answer the arguments of my friend who has followed in the track of many of his brethren who have written on the same subjects before him. The quotations are taken generally from the works of Pendleton, Ford, Booth, Stuart, Fuller, Mell and others, whose Christian character for truth no one can with reason doubt.

It will moreover be seen that the writer has done little more in adverting to the mode of baptism and the origin of infant baptism, than to collect and arrange *concessions* of the greatest and best men found in the Pedo Baptist world. A body of concessions so complete and overwhelming at every point could not be found in regard to any other practice, yet maintained by such large bodies of excellent Christians as still uphold infant baptism and sprinkling or pouring as the proper mode. The Scriptures, themselves, we think, are plain and easily to be understood by every unbiased reader, much more so to the unlettered mind than the mystified volumes of Doctors of Divinity, written often to support the dogmas of their own class than to throw light upon obscure portions of the Word of God. In conclusion, for his Christian brethren of every denomination the writer has ever cherished fraternal attachments and affection, and the many hard things said of us does not prevent us from extending to them the hand of Christian fellowship.

The Author.

384880

The Church.

—o—

CHAPTER I.

On page 33, Dr. Hudson gives his definition of what a Church is, which is found in the Meth. Discip., Art. 13th, Chap. 1st, as follows: "The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of *faithful men*, in which the pure word of God is preached and the sacraments duly administered according to Christ's ordinances in all things that of necessity are requisite to the same." The Dr. then adds: "The definition of a Church given in the above Article is broad and comprehensive. A congregation of faithful men. The recognition of the Bible or the pure word of God as the rule of faith and practice." On the next page he says: "Denominational exclusiveness grows out of a *false* definition of what a Gospel Church is—the Baptists define—a visible Church of Christ is a congregation of baptized (immersed) believers," &c., and this definition he says cuts off all Churches whose members are not immersed. Hence their exclusiveness. On page 93, he says: "To require immersion in order to admission into the Church is contrary to the teaching of the Bible. * * * And to exclude pious Christians from the Lord's table because they have not been immersed is *narrow-hearted bigotry*." But the 5th Article of his Discipline reads: "The Holy Scriptures contain all things necessary to salvation, so that whatsoever is not *read* therein, nor may be *proved* thereby is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an Article of *faith*." Dr. H. says: "This Article teaches that the Bible is to be appealed to in the final

settlement of all questions of faith and practice." And still he takes upon himself the responsibility of fastening *indecency and narrow-hearted bigotry* upon the Baptists who sincerely appeal to the Bible as *their only rule of faith and practice*. They have no other Discipline—no laws of Bishops or Conferences to guide or govern them. By the *Bible* must they *stand* or *fall*.

There can be only one Scriptural Church of Christ unless Christ founded more than one and gave them different laws. This we are sure needs no proof; it is self-evident. His people are said to be *one*. "There is one fold and one Shepherd." There were to be no divisions among them. They were all to speak the same thing. We read, it is true, of different individual Churches, as the Church of Ephesus, the Church at Phillippi, and so on, separate, distinct and independent organizations. But they were one in doctrine—one in practice. They all walked by the same rule. They had all "One Lord, one faith, one baptism." We nowhere read of the "*Branches* of the Church," nor anything like *the Church* of England, The High Church, The Low Church, The Methodist Episcopal Church, North or South, &c. We read of the Churches of Judea, of the Churches of Gallatia, of Samaria, of Gallilee and of Asia, &c., but not one word about the establishment which embraces them all, or any number of them all in one *great Church*. No one can fairly and impartially read the New Testament and not discover that the Church Christ ordained, set up, was a visible *local assembly*, having no lords, no masters, no rulers but Christ himself who is its head. Each Church, as it was organized, was complete within itself and entirely independent of all others. It was not a combination of any Churches, or as our Methodist friends would say "Societies." So nowhere do the Scriptures mention anything like a vast combination of societies, subordinate and dependent upon one general *Church*. Each Church constituted by the Apostles was democratic

in principle and independent of all others in all its transactions. Such are the Baptist Churches, as we shall show from that day till the present, Apostolic in origin and Apostolic in practice. The Baptists have as much right to give their definition of what they believe to be a true Gospel Church is, as the Methodists. And the 5th Art. of their Discipline before quoted, says: "Whatsoever is not '*read therein*' nor may be '*proved thereby*' is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of faith." Now, let us apply this rule: The Baptists don't "read in the Scriptures" that a Gospel Church consisted of any but immersed believers, nor do they think it can be proved thereby to the contrary. Anthing else, therefore, according to the Dr's. theory, "Is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of faith." But to return to the Scriptures to see if we cannot learn certainly what is a Gospel Church. Christ used the word but twice while on earth. The first is Matthew xvi–18: "On this rock will I build my Church and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." And this is the first place it is used in the New Testament.

On this important text we shall use the ideas and some of the language of a distinguished modern writer, being so pertinent to our purpose. Now, what was it our Saviour said he would build? We can ascertain by examining the *object built*, after it was completed. We have already seen that it was a *local and independent assembly*. But the objecter will say "That it was to be a *perpetual organization*," since "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." But no local organization has been *perpetual*, therefore it cannot have been any local organization." That the first Churches have long ago vanished from the earth. In the very cities where the apostles constituted so many Churches, even upon their ruins, "idolatry and paganism hold supreme sway." This view at first seems reasonable. Yet we think we can show that Christ's Church was a *visible lo-*

cal organization, and independent, has never ceased to exist during these 1800 years. It is not the Methodist Church, for Dr. H. says that was founded by John Wesley about 100 years ago, and it is not the Presbyterian, for that was founded by John Calvin. It was not the Episcopal, for that began with King Henry the VIII. It was not the Lutheran, for Martin Luther was its founder. It was not the Roman Catholic, for that belongs to Satin, and was first formally organized by Constantine, the first Christian Emperor of Rome, and who assumed supreme control of both Church and State during the 4th century of the Christian era. What is it then? How has it existed? Let us see—you might say—"It was the Church universal—that it consisted of all the true Churches of Christ in one general organization." But if you mean by this "some universal Church, and not existing in a practicable way," we cannot answer. But if you mean that there was an actual and visible organization which included all the members of the Churches of Christ, you can surely produce some of its acts and doings. For we have the acts of the Church at Antioch, some records of the Church at Jerusalem and of others; but we see nothing of the sayings or doings of this universal Church. If any such existed there surely would have been some history of it left on record. We find nothing of it in the Scriptures. The Churches spoken of by the apostles were separate, independent bodies, and never combined in any such general Church. And the Saviour's language could hardly apply to anything *invisible*, for a building is not only a *visible* but *tangible* object. "Upon this rock will I build my Church," does not mean any particular Church as at Jerusalem, &c., nor does it mean one great Church composed of all others, but it simply meant the *name of his institution.* To make it more plain—we speak of *the court's* decision or the *court's* charge—the verdict of the jury, &c. Now, everybody knows when we speak of the *court* or the *jury*, we do not mean any partic-

ular individual judge, nor any particular body of 12 men, nor do we mean all the *judges* or *juries* in *one*, but simply before that judge or jury before whom the trial may come. Indeed a suit at law may continue from one court to another. The first be dissolved and jury discharged—others follow and disappear—*the jury* is still an institution for the administration of justice—thousands of juries may be dismissed, still the jury, as an institution, is *perpetual*. It will continue as long as the constitution of the English or American Government shall last. And if we should say it is an institution "*built*" on the "*rock*" of our constitution, and that all traitors and tyrants "*cannot prevail against*" and overthrow the institution of the jury, we should speak of it in the same manner as Christ did of his Church. We think this is plain. If this be so, let us look a little further into this text. What did Christ mean by the word "*rock*," upon which he built his Church? (We have our Greek Testament before us, written in the very same language the Saviour spoke.) He could not have meant Peter, as some have argued—for the word petros first used —"Thou art *petros*"—is in the masculine gender, and then immediately the gender is changed to the neutra *petra*—thus: "Thou art *Petros*, and upon this *petra* I will build my church." He says to Peter, your name is Rock, and upon this rock, &c. Peter's name suggested the figure used. But what did he mean? Read the context and it is as plain as any other passage. Christ asked his apostles what people said about him. "Whom do men say that I am?" They answered, "Some say John the Baptist, some Elias, &c." "But whom do *you* say that I am?" Peter answered for them all: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." This was their *confession of faith*. It was what Christ wanted to hear them say. It was their *faith* in him their only hope for salvation. Jesus replies that such faith came from God alone. "Blessed art thou, Simon, son of Jonas, for flesh and blood have not revealed

this unto thee; but my Father." It was *Peter's faith* and likewise the confession of it, that formed the foundation, in a figurative sense, of this building. "The Church consists of individuals, but before these individuals can be erected into a Church, *the foundation* must be laid by a profession like Peter's, of faith in Christ." The foundation is *a* prerequisite for a permanent building. So this *confession of faith* was a prerequisite essential and necessary to the foundation of Christ's Church. The Church consists of *individuals*, but before these individuals can be erected into a Church, the foundation must be laid on their part by a profession of faith in Christ. The proper materials for the building *must be of faith*. Philip said to the Eunich, "If thou believest, thou mayst be baptized"—no other condition would suffice. A jury would not *be legal*, unless qualified as the law directs. So a church having been founded on any other "*rock*" than "*faith*" is not a Gospel Church. The *Master* so orders it. So we see it is a local organization made up only of those who profess *faith in Christ*, as did the Apostles.

Paul says to the Church at Corinth: "Ye are God's building."—(1 Cor. 111-9.) To the Ephesians, he says: "In whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit." So in Col. 11-6-7: "As ye have received Christ Jesus the Lord, so walk ye in him, rooted (founded) and *built* up in him, and established in the *faith* that ye have been taught." So in Jude, "Building up of yourselves *on your most holy faith.*" And thus we see a true Gospel Church rests on the *rock of faith*, and not on external forms. It consists also of *believers*, and not believers and their baptized children and "penitent seekers." It is a *perpetual* institution, standing amid the storms of persecution, sacrifices and death of its advocates from its first organization till now. "The gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Its martyrs, by their blood and the smoke of their ashes, have cemented its walls to everlast-

ing glory. It has never become APOSTATE, and never needs to be reformed or changed by the inventions of men.

Now look at the only other text the Saviour uses the word *Church*. Here it is—Matt. 18th—"Moreover, if thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone. If he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother; but if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. And if he neglect to hear them *tell it to the Church*; but if he shall neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican."

How simple is this declaration of our Saviour! He here lays down the fundamental law of discipline in his Church. How carefully does he provide for the rights of the members to secure harmony among them! If the member aggrieved fails to obtain reconciliation with the offender, he is to *tell it to the Church;* and if he will not hear the Church, he is to be cut off from membership. The Church is the final arbiter, from which there is no appeal. The Church is supreme—its decisions cannot be reversed. Christ alone is its head and author. The Church is his executive. What the Church does is to settle all matters of discipline. No one man, however high in authority, must "lord it over God's heritage." The minister, the pastor, is but the servant of the Church, and is amenable to it alone, if he should become guilty of immoral conduct. Its laws and ordinances are of Divine authority, and cannot be changed. Yet Dr. Hudson says, "Every particular Church may ordain, *change* or *abolish rites* and ceremonies so all things be done to edification." See Methodist Discipline, page 31. Now, Christ's Church, if it be an executive, cannot be also a legislative institution. It cannot make its laws and then execute them. It cannot change or abolish any of the rites (ordinances) committed to its keeping. The Church that does this is not the one Christ organized. The

plan he laid down, the Apostles and their followers *strictly* observe. But how does an offended member in the Methodist Church seek for relief? Christ says, "Tell it to the Church." His brethren say, "No; you must tell it to the minister in charge, or to a committee appointed by him." If he and they do not decide and please both, why go to the Quarterly Conference, and if you don't obtain satisfaction there, go to tho Bishops, or to those whom he may appoint. The Church, that is the local assembly to which the brethren belong, is not known in the matter. The whole business is taken away from the place where Christ fixed it and lodged in the hands of those who are in authority over the Church. The command is, "Tell it to the Church," whose decision is final, from it there is no appeal. The laws of Christ are as immutable as himself. There is no human authority "to *change* or *abolish* them." No Quarterly or Annual Conference, or Bishops must usurp the rights of the Church. On page 41 of the Discipline, Section 7, this question is asked: "What are the duties of the elder, deacon or preacher who has charge of a circuit, or station? ANSWER.—"*To receive, try and expel members, according to the form of the Discipline.*" This is what the preacher is to do—*receive, try and expel* members. The great Apostle Paul was a cipher in his day, compared to one of these Methodist circuit riders, in power and authority. Again, on page 84 of the copy before me, this question is asked: To whom is a Bishop amenable for *his* conduct? ANSWER.—"To the *General Conference.*" Again, question 4: What shall be done when an elder, deacon or preacher is under report of being guilty of some crime?

Answer, "Let the Presiding Elder in the absence of a Bishop call as many traveling ministers as he shall see fit, at least three, and, if possible, bring the accused face to face. If the person be clearly convicted he shall be *suspended* from all official services in the Church till the *ensuing Annual Conference*," &c., &c. So it seems the Church

has nothing to do in such matters, while Christ says, "The Church alone has power to try and discipline its members, no matter what position they may fill. On page 91, "What shall be done with a local elder, deacon or preacher, reported to be guilty of improper temper, words or actions?" Answer: "The person so offending shall be reprehended by the preacher in charge. Should a second offense take place, one, two or three faithful friends are to be taken as witnesses. If he then be not cured, he shall be *tried at the next Annual Conference*," and so on up to the higher orders of this Higherarchy. We nowhere find in the commands of Christ, or in the Acts of the Apostles such monarchy, such power even over offending members. All matters of discipline were left to this independent, local assembly of believers and their decision was final. There was no one to reverse *their* acts, no appeal to Elders and Bishops and Conferences. Here we see marks of great difference between the true Gospel Church which Christ organized and the one claimed by Dr. Hudson to be the "nearest pattern" to this. But let us now briefly examine the character of those who compose the true Gospel Church. Whatever the Church was as first organized it is yet and will remain the same till time shall be no more, "For the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." The *precise time* when the first Church was we do not know. We first find it transacting business in Acts 1–15. It then consisted of only 120 members who met in an "upper room" and after prayer ELECTED one of their number to fill the vacancy occasioned by the death of Judas. Those were all disciples. They were all professed believers. They were *men and women*, but no children. We observe, too, the vacancy was filled by ELECTION, chosen by *ballot*, not appointed by some Bishop or Conference. Soon after this we read that (3000) three thousand were added in a single day and it was called the Church which was at Jerusalem. All these were old enough to "repent" and "gladly receive the

word," and when they had done so, were baptized and added to the Church, and, like the first, they "continued steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, breaking of bread and in prayers."—Acts II–42. It seems, therefore, that not a single one of these was a little babe. They were all *believers*. Five thousand others were added, (Acts 4–4,) both men and women, all others excluded. So also the great company of priests, (Acts 6–7,) were not admitted till they had "*become obedient to the faith.*" Here are over eight thousand members, but not one who was not a professed believer. These and these alone composed the Church. If there were any children, or *unconverted seekers*, Luke was a false historian for he never intimates that there were children in the Church.

Can it be possible then that a congregation which admits infants and "penitent seekers" to membership can be called a true Church of Christ! Refer to "Methodist Tracts." In No. XII, page 248, it says: "By baptism we are admitted into the Church." Again, page 254, Sec. 6: "If infants ought to come to Christ—if they are capable of admission into the Church of God—then they are proper subjects of baptism. But *infants are capable of coming to Christ*—of admission to the Church, and solemnly dedicated to God, therefore, his disciples or ministers are still to suffer infants to come—that is to be brought into the Church!"

Here is a Church then, (the Methodist) made up of three classes of persons, viz: Believers, unbelievers, and infants who are not conscious of their becoming such. We read nowhere of any such Church in the Scriptures. But let us examine further. There is a book called "The History of Methodism as it was and is," written by the Rev. P. D. Gorrie, published in 1852 and adopted as one of their standard works. On page 170 it says: 1st. The nature of Baptism, "It is a figurative ordinance, symbolical of our death unto sin, and our being born again from above,

of being purified by the water of regeneration and receiving of the Holy Ghost." So we see. When Dr. H. baptizes (sprinkles) the baby, it signifies that "it has died unto sin and been born again from above"—"that it is, or has been purified by the water of regeneration and has received the Holy Ghost." Do we not state the case fairly? Let the reader judge for himself.

But again, 2nd, he says: "Baptism is a sign of profession—a *rite* which was constituted under the law and retained under the Gospel as the distinguishing mark or sign of a profession of faith." So when you baptize an infant or "penieent seeker" it is a sign that they have professed their faith in Christ! Again, 3rd, "Baptism is also considered the door of entrance into the Church." On page 173, he says: "That infants are scriptural subjects of baptism appears from the following consideration: 1st, the perpetuity of the Abrahamic covenant which included children as well as adults. 2nd, the eligibility of children to Church memberships. And after arguing this point drawn from the circumcision of the old Jews, says: "There can be no reasonable doubt that infants are entitled to the initiatory rite which will formally admit them into the visible Church of Christ." The writer goes on at length to prove that infants are as much entitled to membership in the Methodist Church as adults. So we see unconscious infants are as much entitled to all the benefits and privileges as grown-up people. Is it not strange, then, when Methodists refuse to commune with a large number of their own members, call the Baptists a set of narrow-hearted bigots because they refuse to commune with those whom they regard as not baptized at all? But Dr. Hudson's Church admits persons who make no profession of faith. On page 155 of his book, he says the Methodist Church, besides opening her doors to adult converts, takes in also penitent seekers, and adds, the following is the condition for the admission of such persons: "There is only one condition pre-

viously required of those who desire admission into the societies—a desire to flee from the wrath to come, and to be saved from their sins." So faith in Christ is not required to become a member of the Methodist Church. "A desire to be saved from their sins" is all that is required. Now, we imagine there are few persons who would not come under the class, who, since they have come to the years of accountability, desire to be saved. Ask almost anyone, however wicked and profane, if he wishes to be saved from his sins, the answer generally will be in the affirmative, and all such are proper subjects for membership in our friend's Church. So if all the children in the world, and all adults who wished to be saved were gathered into a Methodist Church, there would be but few left out in the world. No wonder Dr. H. is enabled to boast in his book, page 229: "While other Churches have been gathering a FEW members through family training and cathechetical instruction, Methodism has "SWEPT THEM IN BY THOUSANDS!" He says, "SWEEP IN THOUSANDS WITH ONE HAUL!!" But Matthew 7-13-14: "For wide is the gate and broad is the way that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat; because strait is the gate and narrow is the way which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it." And Dr. Watts puts it in solemn verse:

"Broad is the road that leads to death,
And THOUSANDS walk together there:
But wisdom shows a narrow path,
With here and there a traveller."

But Dr. Hudson defines "Baptism to be a sign of Regeneration," and then on page 64, he defines regeneration to be the new faith, the work of the Holy Spirit by which we experience a change of heart—that regeneration is the removal of the pollution of sin." Now, how is it? Penitent seekers are baptized while yet in their sins. "Baptism is a sign of regeneration, and regeneration is a sign of the new birth—the work of the Holy Spirit by which we experience a change of heart—that it is the removal of the pol-

lution of sin." This makes those who are not believers, and infants who can't believe, fit subjects of Christ's kingdom, by being baptized into the Methodist Church. Now, if this does not involve our friend in the doctrine of Baptismal regeneration, it comes with bad grace to charge the Baptists with this unscriptural dogma. That is, to make the matter plain, we repeat, if as Dr. Hudsod maintains: "Baptism is the sign of regeneration, and regeneration is the sign of conversion," unconverted persons and unconscious babes are baptized. Therefore, they are regenerated, born again and have experienced a change of heart, because they are baptized or sprinkled by some Methodist Minister! But to remove all doubt in the mind of the reader on this point, we will prove by their own authority that the only object of baptizing (sprinkling) infants originally intended to make them fit subjects for heaven, and without it they would be forever lost. Now for the proofs. John Wesley says in his Doctrinal Tracts, page 251, published and circulated by the "Methodist Book Concern," "If infants are guilty of original sin, then they are proper subjects of Baptism, seeing in their ordinary way, they cannot be saved unless this be washed away by Baptism. "And it has already been proved," says he, "that this original stain cleaves to every child of man, and that truly they are the children of wrath and liable to ETERNAL DAMNATION. It is true the second Adam has found a remedy for the disease which came upon all by the offence of the first. But the benefit of this is to receive through the means which he hath appointed, through Baptism in particular, which is the ordinary means he hath appointed for that purpose, and to which God hath tied us, though he may not have tied Himself. Indeed, when it cannot be had (those yet unborn) the case is different, but extraordinary cases do not make void a standing rule. This, therefore, is our first ground—infants need to be washed from original sin, therefore they are proper subjects of baptism."

Again, on page 248, he says, "By baptism, we who were the children of wrath are made the children of God." This is grounded on the plain Word of God: "Except a man be born of the water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God" (John 111-5.) "By water as a means, the water of baptism, we are regenerated or born again." Now, we have quoted the above correctly, as the words of the Founder of Methodism, THE FATHER of the Methodist Church and cited the reader to the pages of these Doctrinal Tracts for satisfaction, which have been endorsed by the Conferences and circulated by the travelling preachers. If a Baptist should be guilty of publishing such language as was laid down by the father of Methodism for the rule and guide of faith in his followers, viz: That infants could not be saved unless their original sin be washed away by baptism, that we are regenerated and born again by the water of baptism, and that we who were the children of wrath by nature, are made the children of God by baptism; we say if a Baptist were to publish such objectionable doctrine, he would be an object of contempt, and be excluded from the Baptist Church.

But infant baptism and its evils we shall discuss in another place in reply to Dr. Hudson's chapter IX, page 94, to which we ask a candid perusal of the reader. For Dr. H. himself says—page 97: "We must believe then either the horrid doctrine of infant damnation or the doctrine of infant baptism!" When the reader reaches this chapter we invite him to pause and wonder, and then read with care.

But to return. We were speaking of the marks of what a true Gospel Church was as taught in the Scriptures. We have found it to be an independent local assembly composed of voluntary believers in Christ and who have been baptized upon a profession of their faith, and we shall show before we get through that immersion alone is baptism, and that sprinkling and pouring used as an ordinance had

their origin with those who "changed the ordinances of Christ to suit the convenience of man," and is a fragment of Popery—that man of sin and son of perdition, who prostituted the Holy Scriptures to the service of the devil. This we will show both from the true meaning of the word of Christ as well as from most of the leading historians of the world, ancient and modern, sacred and profane. We object to the Methodist as being the true Church of Christ. Because, 1st. It is not an independent body—it is ruled by Bishops. 2nd. Its laws are made first by Conferences and Bishops. Its laws are executed by its preachers. The people have no voice in making the laws or their execution. The Bishop is elected by the preachers. The society or Church must receive the preacher imposed upon them by the Bishop, or have none at all.

All power is in the hands of Bishops, Conferences or preachers, and none in the Churches where Christ and His Apostles placed it. Again, the Methodist Church is composed in part of unconverted seekers and infants, while the Gospel Church is composed of professed believers only. Again it is subject to the preachers—it cannot choose its own pastors—it is dependent for its very existence as a Church, while a Gospel Church recognizes no authority above it but Christ. Again, the Methodist Church is subject to the laws of Conferences even as to the rights of its own members, and some of its members are brought in by the authority of parents, having no will of their own, while the Church of Christ acknowledges no law-givers except those found in the Testament, and its members become such by their voluntary act alone. Again, the Methodist Church holds and teaches salvation by faith, but partially nullifies this good doctrine by teaching baptismal regeneration as we have clearly shown. It was conceived and established by Mr. Wesley and other men and began in 1784 by the authority of two Bishops and sixty preachers while a true Gospel Church holds its articles of faith upon

the fundamental doctrines of the Apostles, and was founded by Christ more than eighteen hundred years ago and has continued down to the present time—"The gates of hell shall never prevail against it."

So we plainly see, so far as the spiritual kingdom is concerned, that Christ is the foundation of the Christian's hope and faith. When it comes to the setting up of the Gospel Church, there we must needs have a declaration of principles and fundamental truths must constitue the foundation of Christ's Church, and these glorious truths he has pointed out as a foundation rock upon which he says he will build his Church. He is the head of His Church in all things. He has not resigned the headship to another, and from thence transmitted it down to successive generations, but He is still the head; for He is to-day a living, present Savior. We have the blessed assurance that the clumsy and contaminated hands of sinful men shall not mar the beauty of the building of God. The Church is composed, not of organized bodies of men, holding their authority in their hands which they received from men written on scrolls of paper, not from communicants of faith that is altered and changed by the councils of Bishops, or Cardinals, or Conferences that meet to make new laws to meet new necessities—not a body of professors who believe in the traditions of men and know no higher authority, and believe the Bible secondary to the edicts of Bishops and Conferences—but a remnant according the election of grace, who have a white stone given them and in the stone a new name written which no man knoweth saving he that receiveth it. A great multitude which no man can number, that have come out of great tribulation, out of every nation, kindred and tongue, and people on earth—the communicants of the one unchangeable faith that was once delivered to the saints.

Though the children may be scattered and their houses of worship burned, their pastors pinioned to the stake and

tortured with fagot or beheaded and stoned, or imprisoned to languish and pine away in dark and filthy dungeons, yet truth will prevail. The blood of the martyrs is the seed of the Church and the Church will survive and finally triumph over all, for "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it," the foundation of God standeth sure forever. "In whom also we have obtained an inheritance being predestinated according to the purpose of Him who worketh all things after the counsel of His own will that we should be to the praise of His glory." O, that the Church which He established 1800 years ago "might look forth as the morning, fair as the moon, clear as the sun and terrible as an army with banners," and that all religionists would be able to see the errors of their leaders and take the Bible as their only rule of faith and practice!

But to close this chapter on the definition of the Church we observe that the Methodist Church, though of recent origin, has changed its base line several different times since it was organized. It is acknowledged their first Church consisted of the preachers and a pair of bishops. And so it was decided in the great Methodist law suit that "the bishops and the travelling preachers are now the Church." "What has before been the rule of the societies, now became the rules of the Church. What were before the terms of admission into the societies, became the terms of admission into the Church." "As it has been only needful for one to profess a desire of salvation to constitute the society, so this was all that was needful to come into the Church." But while the laws of Christ's Church were to remain "steadfast and immovable," those of the Methodist have already undergone many and important changes. For instance, in regard to slavery in the United States: many years ago, to own slaves was made a bar of fellowship and communion among its own members. It was the business of the circuit preacher to take with him his blank-book and take down the names and ages of all the

slaves belonging to any of their members with a view of expelling all such masters who did not free their slaves at a certain time fixed by the Conference, and though their rules would invite members of other denominations, who owned slaves, to the communion table with them, yet positively excluded their own members from such privileges who refused to free their slaves as required by the Discipline.

The writer well remembers a striking case of this kind when a pious and very useful minister of the Methodist Church withdrew his name from among them rather than submit to such tyranny. It is a curiosity to go back and read over the rules and changes made from time to time in their Discipline, made by men who make no pretension to divine authority, but bind its members to strict observance. According to the early editions of the Methodist Discipline, no man, however pious and exalted in society, however useful and beloved among his fellows, if he owned slaves and did not set them free, as prescribed in the Discipline, should be expelled from the Church. This law was at a later day repealed. Still the Discipline, after undergoing many and radical changes, is yet the rule and guide of faith and practice of Methodists. The Bible alone furnishes all articles of faith for a true Gospel Church and to it the Baptists as a body of Christians, have rigidly adhered for 1800 years, through persecution, suffering and death.

Now, reader, if you will turn to the last chapter of this little work, you will find a brief outline of the RISE AND PROGRESS of the Baptists, from which you will be able to form an opinion as to Dr. Hudson's knowledge of history in his accounting Roger Williams the founder of the Baptist Church. You will see how faithful historians record how thousands of Baptists, or those holding similar doctrines, but existing in different ages under different names, have died in behalf of soul-liberty—have died as "witnesses of Jesus," because they have strenuously maintained and

contended "for the faith once delivered to the Saints," and for the ordinances as they were committed to the Church by its Great Head. You will see how the tree of religious and civil liberty was watered by the precious blood of martyrs. Living as we do in times when the fruit of this tree is fed upon by so many millions of the human race, we perhaps fail in appreciating the fact that this constitutes the noble legacy which the Baptists of all ages have bequeathed to living generations and to generations yet unborn, and for which, with martyr devotion, they have struggled and suffered, and agonized and died from the beginning of the Christian era. "Not only have Baptists been subjected to the exquisite tortures which a hellish and cunning ingenuity could devise, but they have been always the objects at which learning and buffoonery have aimed their poisoned darts." Other Christian denominations have done their share of this small work in ridiculing and defaming this set of "narrow-hearted bigots." But however reluctant small minds and narrow souls may be to confess these truths, it is pleasant to know there are persons of capacious intellects, of exalted nature, and large, liberal-hearted views, who cordially acknowledge the great worth of the Baptist denomination. Hear what THOMAS CHALMERS, the great Scotch Presbyterian, and eminent scholar, says: "Let it never be forgotten of the Baptists, that they form the denomination of Fuller, and Cary, and Ryland, and Hall, and Foster; that they originated the first of all Missionary enterprises; that they have enriched the Christian literature of our country with an authorship of the most exalted piety, as well as the first talent, and the first eloquence; that they have waged a noble war with the *hydra* of Antinomianism, that perhaps there is not a more intellectual community of ministers, who have to their number put forth a greater amount of mental power and mental ability in the defence and illustration of our common faith, and what is still better than all the tri-

umphs of genius and understanding, who by their zeal and fidelity and pastoral labor among the congregations which they have reared, have done more to swell the lists of genuine Discipleship in all the walks of private society, and thus to uphold and extend the living Christianity of our nation." So says Dr. Chalmers, one of the greatest men of England and a Presbyterian. Dr. Baird, another very distinguished Presbyterian divine, says: "The Baptists comprehend a body of men, who in point of talents, learning and eloquence, as well as devoted piety, have no superiors in the country." But we did not intend to detain the reader on this subject, which he will find more fully stated in the conclusion of this little volume.

CHAPTER II.

Having briefly stated our views of what constitutes a true Gospel Church together with objections to our friend's ideas of it, we come now to consider his Chapter VII, page 79, "Mode of Baptism."

He says "We conclude then that water *applied* in the name of the Trinity by a Gospel minister to a proper candate is Christian baptism." "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost." "It will be seen," says Dr. H., "from the above definition, that the MODE of baptism is not one of its essential elements; that all the essentials of baptism will be preserved when administered by the mode of pouring, sprinkling, or immersion. Therefore the Methodist Church holds that the three modes are *equally valid*, but that the *weight of evidence* is in favor of *pouring and sprinkling*. Pouring and sprinkling are really only one mode, they being alike as to mode, the difference being the freer use of water in pouring. The terms are borrowed from the Bible." "I will pour out my Spirit, and then will I sprinkle clean water upon you."

Now, Dr. H. says, there are three modes of baptism, "pouring, sprinkling and immersion," and that the "Methodist Church holds that these modes are equally valid." Is it not strange, then, that these three modes being equally valid, Dr. Hudson should consume so large a portion of his book in attempting to prove that immersion is nowhere taught in the Scriptures, nay more, that it is a practice "repulsive to the feelings, dangerous to the health and offensive to delicacy!!" What confidence would a man of the world have in a preacher of the Gospel, urging him to become a Christian, when he sees or hears him thus ridiculing one of God's most holy ordinances, admitting it to be equally valid, and in the same breath denouncing the same to be "indecent" and without "scriptural authority!" But

he says there are *three* modes, while the inspired Apostle says to the Church at Ephesus, "One Lord, one faith, *one baptism.*" Who is likely to be correct, Dr. Hudson or St. Paul? Dr. H. says, "We conclude that water applied in the name of the Trinity by a Gospel minister to a proper candidate is Christian baptism."

Now, we would ask where he gets such authority that Christian baptism is water applied to the subject? Certainly not in the Scriptures, if so he would not have failed to refer his readers to the text. There is no such intimation in the word of God, that Christian baptism is "water applied to the candidate." This kind of baptism, we shall show, is of human invention. The Savior Himself was *applied* to the water and not the water to Him. John baptized (immersed) Jesus in the river—in the water—and "He came up straightway *out of the water*"—no application of water here to the candidate, but the candidate was dipped or immersed in the water. Philip led the Eunuch down *into the water* and there baptized (immersed) him, and then both *came up out of the water*, Acts 8. Here, again, the candidate was applied to the water and not the water to the subject.

But Dr. H. says "the terms pouring and sprinkling are terms borrowed from the Bible," and then quotes as follows: "I will pour out my spirit and then I will sprinkle clean water upon you." The first clause of the above sentence is found in Isaiah, 44–3, and the latter clause in Ezekiel, 36–25. Now our author must be hard pressed indeed to find authority in the Bible for pouring or sprinkling as a mode of Christian baptism. He first goes away into the Old Testament and finds where the Prophet Isaiah uses the word *pour*, having no reference whatever to the ordinance of baptism and then takes a part of the 3rd verse of the 44th chapter and sticks it on to a part of Ezekiel 36th chapter, 25th verse, and makes up his quotation, "I will pour out my spirit, and then will I sprinkle clean water

upon you." What subterfuge! Who that desires to know the truth and his duty in obeying the ordinance of baptism would ever think of going back to the old prophets to learn what it was! An institution which Christ set up Himself set the example, and as clearly taught his disciples, both by precept as well as example in language and symbols so plain that for hundreds of years there was not even the shadow of doubt what was the true and only form. But let us go back to Isaiah and read the whole passage, verse 3d: "For I will pour water upon him that is *thirsty*, and *floods* upon the dry ground; I will pour my Spirit upon thy seed and my *blessings* upon thine offspring." Then Ezekiel 36–25, "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean; from all your filthiness, and from all your idols will I cleanse you." Now the man that can see Christian baptism in the above language is capable of believing that Jonah swallowed the whale! Besides the instance above mentioned there are but two others where the sprinkling of water is used in the whole Bible. In Numbers, 8th and 19th chapters, the same figure is expressed in reference to purification and cleansing "from filthiness, from idols," &c., just as it is in Ezekiel. We are rather at a loss to know why our friend did not seize on to these other two texts to sustain his "lost cause." He surely must have failed to find them or they would have been brought out as proof texts that sprinkling was Christian baptism; that John either sprinkled or poured the Savior in the river Jordan; that Phillip sprinkled or poured the Eunuch in the water and that John was sprinkling or pouring in Enon, because there was much water there.

But as Dr. H. insists that in baptism water is applied to the subject and not the subject to the water, and that there is no difference in the modes of pouring and sprinkling except the former requires a little more water. Now the writer is curious to know *how much water* is required to constitute baptism by his favorite modes? How many

drops to *make a sprinkle*, and what kind of a vessel is necessary out of which to pour the water. Surely as baptism is a *positive institution*, our friend can read from the Scripture how the Apostles acted in this matter. Again, we would inquire what part of the body is the *water to be applied* to make valid baptism? Must it be on the head in front or on the back? Or the face? Or would not a little on the hands or indeed the feet be the proper locality. For we read of a sect in ancient times who washed their feet and called it baptism and appealed to John XIII–10 in justification of their conduct. Surely our friend has some preference on what part of the body the water shall fall when it is sprinkled or poured. He says baptism has taken the place of circumcision, and every one knows that unless circumcision was performed precisely according to the Jewish law—on the precise locality of the body given in the command, it would not answer; it would not be received as circumcision at all. So if baptism has taken its place, as the strict letter of the law was to be followed in the one case, so it seems to us it should not be neglected in the other. Baptism being a positive institution as well as those ancient rites, what reason can our opponents assign for not specifying what particular part of the body the water is to be applied?

But on the same page (80) of his book, Dr. Hudson takes hold of the oft-repeated Pedo-Baptist grounds, (and which have been as often thoroughly exploded) of attempting to prove baptism by pouring as the mode, because the Scriptures speak of the Holy Ghost as being poured out. But few, if any, of the learned men of the Pedo-Baptist denomination, however, maintain such a weak and untenable position. For it is clear to be seen that to make Holy Ghost baptism and water baptism synonymous is to materialize the Holy Spirit. Here are his texts: "The Holy Ghost *fell* on all them that heard," and "on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost."—Acts 10,

44–47, and he says: "Then Peter baptized those on whom the Holy Spirit was poured out." "Now," he adds, "as the Holy Spirit was *poured* upon the people, it is ALMOST certain that Peter poured water upon them as the most fitting mode of baptism." The Dr. would have us believe that Peter saw with his natural eyes the Holy Spirit pouring down upon the people, coming down in a stream as you see water poured out of a pitcher, and therefore Peter in like manner took water and poured it upon the people! But he says the word baptism means to pour or a pouring. Now substitute the word poured in lieu of the word baptized in the above sentence and see how it reads: "Peter poured those on whom the Holy Spirit was poured out." How nonsensical! Now take the true translation of the word baptized and see how plain and natural. "Peter immersed those on whom the Holy Spirit was poured out." But hear what that great and good man, Dr. Barnes, says of this Holy Ghost baptism in his notes on the 10th chapter of Matthew. He explains it thus: "Are you able to be plunged deep in afflictions and to have sorrows cover you like water and to be sunk beneath calamities as a flood? Now in this there is no literal immersion, but the sorrow is represented as covering and swallowing up the mind as water does the body in the act of baptism. It is a metaphorical but not a real baptism. So in the case before us. As Christ had told James and John that they should be immersed or overwhelmed by suffering and sorrow, so now he tells all the disciples that they shall in a few days be *immersed or overwhelmed* by the influences of the Holy Spirit. That these influences cover, overpower and swallow up their minds as the water in baptism did their bodies. It is no more a literal baptism than the baptism of suffering in Matthew. It is a metaphor, and the allusion is not to the act done in baptism, so much as to the result—that is the swallowing up and overwhelming of their minds by the flood of life, and light and joy, and

heavenly influence which that day came (poured) upon their souls." This is what Dr. Barnes says who was one of the great lights of the Presbyterian Church, celebrated for his learning as well as his devotion to his Master. Compare his purely Scriptural comments with those of our friend. And see how speedily the latter's theories vanish like the mists of the morning before the brilliant rays of the rising sun.

On his next page (81) Dr. H. quotes Dr. Pope, a Wesleyan minister of England, thus. "There are many considerations which lead us to regard affusion or sprinkling as the ordained rite. The Catholic design of the Gospel suggests that the simplest and most universally practicable ordinance would be appointed. Again, the most important realities of which baptism is only the sign are such as sprinkling or affusion indicates. The blood of atonement was sprinkled on the people and on the mercy seat, and the gifts of the Holy Ghost are generally illustrated by the pouring of water and the anointing." Now it seems like a pity to spoil this ingenious fortification, this the almost forlorn hope of our opponents to maintain their favorite mode of baptism. But as it has often been demolished and they continue to set it up again, it must continue to be pulled down, until our Lord sees fit it shall no more be held up as a Christian ordinance. If our Saviour wished it to be so, he certainly would have appointed it. But he seems to have preferred immersion in water; and this, while it may signify the cleansing of the Holy Spirit, yet the design is better signified in our death and burial to sin, and our living again to righteousness; and it is thus that Paul explains it when he says, "We are buried with him by baptism into death, that as Christ was raised from the dead so we should walk in newness of life." It serves also to remind us of the burial and resurrection of Jesus and prefigures also our own coming death, burial and resurrection. As the other ordinance (the Lord's Supper) repre-

sents the broken body and shed blood of our Saviour, so *baptism* is designed to represent His burial and resurrection. Pouring and sprinkling can't do this; it may suit the machinations of man; it may as Dr. H. says, be "more simple, more practicable," but Christ did not so command and the Apostles did not so teach, nor did the Disciples ever practice it. Now let us pause here, and offset the Dr.'s last quotation by giving others in opposition thereto and then let the reader form his opinion as to the best authority.

Dr. James McKnight, an eminent Presbyterian divine, for 20 years the Moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in England, says: "Jesus submitted to be baptized; that is to be put under the water and taken out again by John."

Dr. Chalmers, to whom we have heretofore alluded, says, "The meaning of the word baptism is immersion." Martin Luther says expressly: "Immersion was without doubt instituted by Christ." John Calvin, the founder of the Presbyterian Church, distinctly states the word baptize signifies to immerse, and the right of immersion was practiced by the ancient Church." (See Institutes.)

Dr. Geo. Campbell, another standard author and a Presbyterian, says, in his notes on the four Gospels, volume 2, page 20: "The word baptize, both in sacred and classical authors, signifies to dip, to plunge, to immerse, and is always construed suitably to this meaning."

Dr. Neander, the great and learned Church historian, on page 197, says, "Baptism for the first three centuries after Christ was administered by immersion." Lord Chancellor King wrote a book called the Primitive Church and published by the Methodists in 1841, says, on page 218: "As for the quantity of water employed in baptism, to me it seems evident that their custom was to dip or immerse the whole body under water." The exception, says he, was in the case of sick persons. The ordination of Novatian was opposed by all the clergy and all the laity, be-

cause of clinic perfusion," being sick he had water poured over him in bed, and for this reason he was rejected on the ground that he had not been baptized, but only poured upon. This was in the third century.

Dr. Whitby, who is the author of more than 40 learned works, says: "Immersion being religiously observed by all Christians for 13 centuries, and the change into sprinkling, even without allowance of the author," &c. (See his notes on Romans, 6–4.)

Bishop Bossuet says: "We are able to make it appear by the acts of councils and by ancient rituals that for thirteen hundred years baptism by immerson was administered throughout the whole Church."

Dr. Mosheim, the celebrated German historian, says: "The Sacrament of Baptism was administered in the first century by the immersion of the whole body." (See volume 1st, page 126, Methodist Edition.) Again: "In the second century the persons baptized were immersed under water." (Vol. 2, page 206.)

Dr. Adam Clark, on Rom. 6–4: "It is probable that the Apostle here alludes to the mode of administering baptism by immersion, the whole body being put under water." (Dr. Clark is a favorite author with Methodists.)

Bishop Taylor: "The custom of the ancient Churches was not to sprinkle, but immersion; in pursuance of the sense of the word, in the commandment, and in the example of our blessed Savior." (Vol. 1, 199.)

But hear what John Wesley says, the father of our friend's Church, commenting on Rom. 6 and 4: "The allusion is to the ancient manner of baptising by immersion." In his journal, Vol. 3, page 20, he relates the circumstance of Mary Welch, aged eleven days, was baptized according to the custom of the ancient Church by *immersion*. Again Wesley on page 24 of his journal, gives us the following narrative: "I was asked to baptize a child of Mr. Parker's, second bailiff of Savannah, but Mrs. Parker told me that

neither she nor Mr. Parker will consent to its being *dipped*. I answered, 'if you will certify to the child's being weakly it will suffice, the Rubric says, to pour water upon it.' She replied, 'Nay, the child is not weak, but I am resolved the child shall not be dipped.' This argument I could not confute, so I went home and the child was baptized by another." This shows Mr. Wesley's practice as well as belief at that time.

The above entry in his journal is dated May 5, 1736. He followed or adhered to the "Rubric," which was then the formula of the Church of England, and it seems required even infants to be immersed. But we find that this wonderful man of God changed his views, and published in the year 1756—20 years after the above narration—a treatise on baptism and contended for pouring or sprinkling as the more Scriptural mode of baptism. Strange inconsistency of this good man! But we will proceed with our testimony of many writers who lived at different times and in different countries of all the different denominations. The falsehood of their united testimony is not to be conceived. The argument which this produces furnishes for the truth of immersion as the only primitive and Apostolic mode, has, in strength and conclusiveness, no parallel in the whole compass of ancient literature. All antiquity does not afford a vestige, public or private, of any contradictory testimony. Though opposition has been most violent, though ridicule, defamation and persecution, were, and are yet employed and displayed against this institution and its adherents, no one presumed to deny the facts. What but *truth* almighty could have stood such an ordeal, or commanded such acquiescence! The Pope issued his edicts against it and those who practiced it were nailed to the stake and their bodies burned to ashes. It yet remains the ever-living monument of the burial and resurrection of our precious Redeemer!

Rev. O. Fisher, of the Methodist Episcopal Society, in a

debate with G. G. Baggerly, at Jarrissa, Texas, August 28, 1853, said: "The days of Baptists are well nigh numbered, for all the Pedo-Baptist denominations are determined to push this vexed question until the wave of immersion shall be stayed." (Pedo-Baptist immersions by Rev. G. W. Purifoy,) who adds: "How do 'the Pedo-Baptist denominations' expect to stop 'the wave of immersion,' when 'in condescension to weak consciences' they immerse? Pedo-Baptists have already tried persecution, confiscation, banishment, fines, imprisonment, stripes, fire, sword, ridicule, sophistry, the inquisition, scoffs, arguments, &c. Still 'the wave of immersion' has rolled on, and is rising higher and higher, stronger, broader and deeper, and will eventually immerse the whole Pedo-Baptist world, for it has already sprung a leak in every branch of 'the Pedo-Baptist denominations' who are determined to stop 'the wave of immersion.'"

William Penn, a Quaker, and founder of Pennsylvania, declared, "There is not one text of Scripture to prove that sprinkling in the face was water baptism, or that children were subjects of water baptism in the first times." Here is high authority of a distinguished Roman Catholic, Archbishop Cullen, who said "immersion was certainly only practiced by the primitive Church; that it was *changed* by the authority of the Church, and but for this power vested in the Church, the ordinance could not have been *changed.* Therefore, in the matter of baptism, the various sects are dependent upon and derive their authority from *us* for the *change* of the ordinance from immersion to pouring and sprinkling." Again he says: "The Baptists alone of all the sects are consistent. Denying the authority of tradition and the power vested in the Church of *binding and loosing*, they adhere strictly to the teachings of Christ and the letter of the New Testament." He further says that the "Baptists *alone* compose the true Church, unless the Church has the power of '*loosing and binding.*'" So it is here truthfully

asserted, by this eminent Catholic *Archbishop*, that our Methodist friends derive their authority for the change of the ordinance from *immersion* to *sprinkling and pouring*, from their grandmother, the Church of Rome, and not from the Scripture. If Dr. H. denies this, hear what Leo I, Pope of Rome A. D. 440, says: "The regular administration of baptism was immersion." Pope Zacharias, A. D. 741, says: "*Immersion was the only practice.*" Cardinal Wiseman says: "We retain the name of baptism, *which means immersion*, though the rite is no longer performed by it, having been *changed* by *The Church.*" Erasmus, this wonderful scholar, quotes Cyprian as saying: "Teach all nations, dipping them in the name," &c. Cyprian lived in the third century with Tertullian and Origen, only about 104 years after the Apostle John. Tertullian also speaks of "John's dipping the people in the river Jordan." One more. Bishop Trevan, a learned Catholic, in his celebrated argument, uses the following remarkable language: "But without going any farther, show us, my lords, the validity of your baptism by Scripture alone." Jesus Christ in the Bible ordains that baptism shall be conferred *not* by *pouring* water on the heads of believers, but by *believers* being *plunged* into the *water*. The word *baptizo* employed by the evangelists *strictly* conveys this signification as *the learned are agreed.*"

We have already referred to the concessions of Drs. Clark and Wesley, of the Methodist Church. We will mention one more. Joseph Benson, a very popular commentator, on Rom. 6–4 remarks: "Therefore, we are buried with Him," alluding to the ancient manner of baptizing by *immersion*. Dr. Benson, may like my friend Dr. Hudson, practice sprinkling, but unlike him confesses that immersion was the ancient *baptism*. Having noticed what Quakers, Catholics and Methodists have conceded to Baptist principles, hear what the most learned scholars and divines of the Episcopalians say. Take Dr. Arthur P. Stanley,

Professor of Ecclesiastical History of the University of Oxford, and who declined the office of Archbishop of Dublin, upon the death of the lamented Whateley. In his lectures published a few years ago, on the history of the Eastern Church, he says: "There can be no question that the original form of baptism, the VERY MEANING OF THE WORD, was *complete immersion* in the deep baptismal waters; and that for at least four centuries any other form was either unknown or regarded, unless in the case of dangerous illness, as an exceptional, almost a MONSTROUS case." Again, "whilst the Greek Church still rigidly adheres to immersion, the Roman Catholic Church, doubtless in deference to the requirements of a Northern climate, to the change of manners, to the convenience of custom, has WHOLLY ALTERED THE MODE, preferring a few drops of water, for the three-fold plunge into the rushing rivers or the wide baptisteries of the East." He says: "The Greek Church is the only *living representative* of the Hellenic race, and speaks the only living voice which has come down to us from the Apostolic age!" And yet this Church which as Stanley says, "*reads the whole code of Scripture*, old as well as new, in the language in which it was read and spoken by the Apostles, this same Greek Church practices only immersion as baptism, and absolutely repudiates and ignores any other mode of administration as essentially valid." This Church prevails over the Byzantine Empire, and numbers its millions. And yet Dr. H. says on page 81, "No Church as such, except the Baptist, requires any particular form of baptism as a *sine qua non* condition of membership." Yet if he will read a little more carefully he will observe a Church outnumbering his own boasted thousands, and that utterly "repudiates and ignores" the validity of my friend's baptism, if the learned and popular Dr. Stanley is to be believed. Another Greek writer, Christopulos, says: "We follow the example of the Apostles, who immersed the candidate under the water." Jeremiah,

another Greek patriarch says: "The ancients were not accustomed to sprinkle but immerse the candidates." Still Dr. H. boldly asserts: "There is no command to baptize by immersion."

We will let Dr. Wall, an Episcopalian, the ablest defender of infant baptism of the Pedo-Baptist denomination, reply to Dr. H. "Immersion was the practice of the Primitive Church. This is so plain and clear by an infinite number of passages, that one cannot but pity the weak endeavors of such Pedo-Baptists as would maintain the negative of it. 'Tis a great want of prudence, as well as honesty to refuse to grant to an adversary what is certainly true and may be proved so."

Thus we see how these great and good men of all denominations are honest in making concessions to the Baptists who rest their rule of practice and faith upon the Bible alone. And why should they do so unless constrained by candor and truth? Why should the master spirits of the ecclesiastical world be found testifying to the truth of Baptist principles, if those principles be not sound, and in accordance with the teachings of the Bible? Men of intelligence and candor are never known to turn witnesses against themselves, either before God or man, unless forced by the truth thus to act. How these Christian writers can reconcile their daily practice, so contrary to these wonderful admissions, I leave for them to settle before a higher tribunal.

"'Tis something strange, we freely own,
That those who preach immersion down,
Should after all the things they say,
Consent to tread this frantic way,
And from the pulpit straight repair
To practice what they censured there.
Rather than lose a wandering sheep,
Whom all their reasonings cannot keep,
To please the man, but not his God,
They will immerse him in the flood."

But we refer once more to page 81 of the Methodist

Armor. Immersion is here affirmed to be "INDECENT AND DANGEROUS."

Our friend's favorite author, Richard Watson, is here quoted and paraded before his readers. It is found in his "Theological Institutes," Vol. II, page 648–660. Since Dr. H. uses only a part of this remarkable language, we here give the reader the benefit of the whole passage. He says, "With all the arrangements of modern times baptism by immersion is *not a decent practice*. There is not a female perhaps who submits to it who has not a great previous struggle with her delicacy." Again: "Even if immersion had been the original mode of baptizing, we should, in the absence of any command on the subject, direct or implied, have thought the Church at liberty to accommodate the manner of applying water to the body in the name of the Trinity, in which the essence of the rite consists, to different climates and manners; but it is satisfactory to discover that all attempts made to impose upon Christians a practice repulsive to the feelings, dangerous to health, and offensive to delicacy, is destitute of all Scriptural authority and of really primitive practice." "Indecent!" "Offensive!" And yet "valid," "equally valid with sprinkling!" It cannot be valid unless Christ appointed it. Our Saviour appoints an ordinance "indecent!" "offensive!" nay, submitted to an indecent thing himself! In the language of a distinguished Baptist who left the Methodist Church: "May Heaven have mercy on the man who makes such an appeal! The vulgarity is in the man and not in immersion."

Dr. Lee, late editor of the Richmond *Christian Advocate*, says: "Is there anything in Christ's personal character that indicates a possible justification of such a scene? (Immersion of a female.) No. He was too pure, too gentle, too modest to institute such a ceremony as an ordinance of His Church. You will find it impossible to imagine Peter and Paul engaged in any such administration

of baptism. We insist that if women must be immersed, it ought to be by moonlight, or if in the face of the sun, in the presence only of women by a blindfolded minister." Again: Methodist Tracts, No. 180: "The idea of being plunged into water is so dreadful to some, that it renders them unfit to wait upon the Lord without distraction." It is a circumstance so revolting to our delicacy in these times that we cannot but think immersion an *innovation*," (No. 130.) "The practice of walking into a river or pond where the water is itself filthy, appearing more like objects of grief than members of that Kingdom which is joy, &c; their hair disheveled, their garments defiled and dripping, is all this commendable in woman?" (Methodist Tracts. 130–180, page 20.) "Baptism by pouring comports with decency, but does immersion."—Methodist Armor, page 93. And yet those who publish and circulate such contemptible abuse of immersion and to whom "the idea is exceedingly dreadful and indecent," immerse all they cannot ridicule out of the notion. "There is no command," says Dr. H., "to baptize by immersion." But we will show before we get through, that he is egregiously mistaken, that the very meaning of the word baptize, implies it in the Great Commission, "Go, teach all nations, baptizing them," &c., that it is a most positive command and requires obedience. He says: "The following Bible examples lead us to believe that the Apostles administered it by pouring or sprinkling."

1. Baptism of Paul, page 81, Armor. "And Ananias went his way," &c. * * * "and he received sight forthwith, and *arose* and was baptized." Acts 9–17–18. Here he insists that Paul could not have been immersed. On the expression, "arise and be baptized, ("literally standing up, be baptized,") "and he arose and was baptized;" ("literally standing up he was baptized;") * * "it definitely and precisely expresses his (Paul's) posture when he received baptism," and concludes: "The whole air

of it is that he *just stood up* from his prostration, in order to be baptized while upon his feet." Now it is urged here that Paul could not have been immersed for he was too weak. "Three days had he been sunk in feebleness and fasting"—he was too feeble to go out to the river—he just stood up from his prostration, "that he was baptized," (sprinkled) "standing up." But why, (we ask) was it necessary for Paul to stand up to be sprinkled or poured upon? Being very weak, as they say, and reclining, he was just in the right position to be sprinkled if that was the mode of baptism he was to receive. He doubtless was in an attitude of prayer, for it is said, "Behold he prayeth." And we have noticed some Methodist ministers administer baptism to the candidate while kneeling. There was no necessity then, for Paul to rise up, in order to have water poured or sprinkled on him. Now if the Bible had said that Paul was too weak to sit up but was baptized in a reclining posture, they would have exclaimed at once: "Do you not see he could not have been immersed, for he was baptized reclining upon a couch?" But "he arose and was baptized," is the language used, the very thing he ought to have done in order to immersion, and yet they claim that this idea is against baptism in that way, for, say they, the word standing, implies that Paul remained in this posture to receive his baptism. But this is not so. "For," says a high authority, "the word rose up indicates motion, preparatory to departure from a place." "It is here used to state that Paul moved off." So we read: "Saul *arose* and got him up to Gilgal." "David *arose* and fled for fear of Saul." "Saul *rose up* out of the cave and went." But poor Paul must "*arise*" and stand still.

There are several places in this chapter in regard to Paul's baptism where the word "arise" is used. "Arise and go into the city." Was he to go "standing still?" "Arise and go into the street which is called straight." Was Ananias standing still as he went? Paul "arose and

was baptized." Where is the proof now that he was "standing still" when he received the rite of baptism?

Is the reader not satisfied that the word "arose" was simply intended to denote the movement of Paul to some place where baptism could be properly administered? But Paul settles the question beyond cavil when he says: "So many of us, as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death. Therefore we are BURIED with him by baptism into death."—Rom. VI, 3-4. Some have insisted that there was no suitable place, or that sufficient water could not be found for Paul's immersion. Let us see. Paul was in Damascus. Naaman said, "Are not Abana and Pharpar, rivers of Damascus, better than all the waters of Israel? May I not wash in them and be clean?"—Second Kings, v-10. Besides much is written of the clearness and sweetness of these two rivers. One of them is said to run along through this ancient city, furnishing the houses with good water, and the other "flows through the orchards and gardens, vineyards and meadows," &c. What a suitable place then for this great Apostle to be baptized in imitation of his Master!

Here we will close this account of Paul's baptism by giving place to Dr. Barnes, the learned Presbyterian divine, who clearly trips up our friend Hudson's theory and drives him to take shelter with the jailer's family where we will follow him. Barnes in his "notes" says of Paul: "The word 'arose,' does not imply that he had been sitting. It does not refer to any change of position but expresses the act of setting out, or beginning to do anything. It was a common expression among the Hebrews to denote entering upon a piece of business. Now if Luke had said he sat still and was baptized, it might have made some difficulty; but if he 'rose up' or prepared himself, he would do this equally whether he was sprinkled or immersed. Immersion is quite as probable, so far as this word is concerned, as sprinkling or anything else." So says this popular author and Pres-

byterian, who is too honest to seize on such weak and untenable argument for sprinkling as an ordinance.

We come next to the "Baptism of the Jailer," page 82, Armor. Dr. H. thinks here he has certainly found a place where "immersion was impossible under the circumstances." Let us see. The recital is found in Acts, 16 ch. Dr. Hudson takes only a part of this passage of Scripture, just so much of it as suits his purpose and then adds: 1st. "The jailer and his family were baptized at the hour of midnight in the prison." 2nd. "*The baptism took place in the prison.*" He says, "We have the authority of the Apostles that they did not go out of the prison. Paul refused to leave the prison privily." "Who can believe," says he "that Paul had gone out to some river at midnight, gone privily, secretly, and immersed the parties and then SLIPPED back into the prison and demanded a public and honorable discharge from the prison after he had already been out. No such hypocrisy can be charged against them. The conclusion is inevitable that they had not been out of prison-bounds."

Again, "There is not the slightest ground for the wild supposition that a Roman prison was provided with anything like a baptistry," &c. "Besides, Philippi was located in the very latitude of 'Snowy Thrace' where such things would not be needed. A bath or tank in a Roman prison! As well expect to find a piano in the wigwam of a flat-headed Indian." He says, "there was a baptism in the prison, but most clearly it was not immersion." He says "it was either sprinkling or pouring," &c., &c. I believe I have got down the Dr's. strongest points on this passage. So here again we will have to pull down this stronghold of Methodism. There was most certainly a baptism administered to the jailer and his family. How was it? There is no mystery or doubt even, about the manner of it. There was no sprinkling, no pouring. Luke, the inspired Apostle, says, "he was immersed, he and all his, straightway," for

the word baptized cannot be and never has been rendered in any language to mean sprinkled; this alone, is sufficient, without any supposed obstacles to forever settle the matter. Besides we have heretofore shown from leading writers and historians of all denominations, from authors, sacred and profane, that no other mode than that of immersion was practiced to any extent for 13 hundred years after Christ ordained it, and that sprinkling and pouring are the inventions of man and not sanctioned by divine authority. But look how incorrectly Dr. H. states the case. He says, "The baptism took place in the prison," that "we have the authority of the Apostles that they did not go out of the prison"—that Paul was too brave a man to go out of the prison to immerse the parties and then "*secretly slip* back into the prison," &c. It was by no means impossible for immersion to take place in the jail. Lord Bacon says, "Bathing with the Romans and Grecians was as usual as eating and sleeping, and so it is with the Turks to this day." It is also said that their prisons were provided with baths. The writer once visited the penitentiary at Albany, N. Y., and a State prison at Detroit, Mich., where the prisoners had bath rooms—water in which their whole bodies could be plunged or immersed—these were for the purpose of cleanliness. And Dr. Judson states that in India baths in prisons were common. That the Philippian jailer had no convenient place for immersion must first be proved before it is granted. The mere assertion will not do. But the truth is, the baptism was not done *in the jail*, as asserted by our opponent. Don't we read, verse 30, how the jailer sprang *into the prison* and brought the Apostles *out of it?* Verse 32—He brought them into *his own house*—they spoke the word of the Lord to all that were in *his house*. So you see the Apostles were in the family apartments. And again, verse 33 he took them somewhere else, washed their stripes, and was himself baptized, and then, verse 34 he brought the Apostles back into his house and

"set meat before them." But who knows where this prison stood? It may have been on the bank of a river, as many of our prisons are in this day and country. It is certain there was a river near (see verse 13) to which the people were accustomed to go for purification. It is highly probable there were conveniences for bathing on the premises of the jailer and this was the opinion of the learned Gratius, "that would most commodiously admit of the ordinance of this form." Even in "Snowy Thrace" the Greeks to this day practice only immersion, and have always repudiated and ignored any other form of baptism. So away goes Dr. Hudson's "Snowy Thrace" idea. As to the wigwam of the flat-headed Indian and his piano, that reminds me of the Indians idea of baptism as related some years ago. A traveling minister of the Methodist Church gave an old Indian a Testament, which he had learned to read in English, and appointed a certain time and place for the purpose of baptizing all who wished to join his Church. The day arrived, and all the candidates were found at the meeting house, but the Indian was missing, and upon inquiry it was told that he was seen sitting on the bank of a stream near by reading his Testament. The preacher sent for him to come to the house if he wished to be baptized along with the others, but says he, "How can you baptize at the house? There is no water there," and insisted that the creek was the place as he read it; but on being told that it was not necessary to be baptized in the creek, that the minister only sprinkled a few drops or poured a little water out of a pitcher or cup in order to baptize one, the Indian replied if that was the case, the preacher had given him the wrong book.

This closes our article on the jailer's family, and we proceed to follow our author to his next stronghold, for although the Indian might have little use for a "piano," yet I venture the assertion, let him learn to read the New Testament for himself, and uninstructed as to the ordinances.

except what he gets by reading the pure word of God, he would not likely be a Methodist; or at least if he should, the preacher would have to "impose upon him a dangerous and indecent" mode.

3rd. "Baptism of Cornelius," page 84, Armor. "While Peter yet spake these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word," &c. * * "Then answered Peter, can any man forbid water that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we? And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord. Then prayed they him to tarry certain days."—Acts. 10-44-48 "The clear inference is that Cornelius and his household were baptized by *pouring*. The circumstance proves this. They went to no river, they are not said to go down to any water, nor are we told that they had a bath adapted for such a purpose in their house. Peter's remark about forbidding water, indicates that it was to be brought to him for the purpose of administering this rite. And above all, it should be noticed, that when the Apostle saw the Holy Spirit DESCENDING upon them, he was reminded of what Christ had said of John's baptizing with water. (Acts. xi--10. Whence this instantaneous recollection and association of ideas, but from the fact that the mode of water baptism was in form the same as that of the descent of the Holy Ghost? Had either John or Peter baptized by dipping the narrative and the allusion would have been grossly inconsistent and calculated to mislead the most devout and clear headed student of inspiration." Here we have quoted the whole argument Dr. H. uses to show that *pouring* in this place was what Peter practiced in his administration of baptism and that "dipping would have been grossly inconsistent." Let us see if he is correct. "The objection here to immersion," says Dr. Pendleton, "is almost a laughable one. The question only means, can any one forbid the baptism of these Gentiles who have received the Holy Spirit as well as the Jews?

Peter does *not* say the "*water was to be brought.*" He only says who will "*forbid water?*" Baptist ministers often say in receiving candidates, "Can any man forbid water," &c. It simply means, can any one object to the baptism of these Gentiles; for this is the first recorded instance of the Gentiles being received into the number of the Disciples. But Dr. H. here again, brings up his favorite idea of Holy Ghost baptism, that as the Apostle "saw the Holy Spirit descending" upon them, it proves conclusively that Peter *poured water* on the heads, faces, or some other parts of the bodies of these Gentiles. Dr. H. would have us believe that Peter actually saw the personal substance of the Holy Spirit poured down in a stream, literally and visibly, and that this suggested to his mind how he should apply water in baptism! But the Scripture does not say that Peter actually "*saw* the Holy Spirit." It says the "Gift of the Holy Ghost was poured out." It was clearly the miraculous influence of the Holy Spirit that was "poured out" and shed forth on the hearts and minds of these people which caused them to "speak with tongues and magnify God." Peter seeing this wonderful change wrought in them, very naturally concluded they were now fit subjects of baptism and therefore "commanded them to be immersed in the name of the Lord." For Dr. Chalmers and all the most eminent divines declare the "original meaning of the word baptism is immersion." If the word means poured, hear how the text would read: "Can any man forbid water that these should be *poured*, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we? And he commanded them to be poured." How ridiculous! Now substitute the word immersed which should have been given in the translation, and it is all natural and plain.

We now come to the next stronghold in the Methodist Armor, page 85.

4th. The Baptism of the three thousand. "Then Peter said unto them, Repent and be baptized, every one of

you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. Then they that gladly received his word were baptized, and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls." (Acts 2—38—41.) This text is often given by our opponents and urged by them as unanswerable by those who maintain immersion to be the only mode. Dr. H. gives us two insurmountable difficulties in the way of immersion. 1st, Not time enough, and 2nd, There was not water enough. This is what he says: "Now, supposing the twelve Apostles to have been engaged in this work, and supposing immersion to have been the mode, it must have been a most laborious, disagreeable, if not impracticable, undertaking to be accomplished in the course of five or six hours. It should be taken into the account, moreover, that at least twenty-four robing rooms, and a dozen dipping places must have been obtained for the purpose," &c.

2nd. "Now, in Jerusalem itself, there was neither a river nor fountain of water. Kedron was little better than the common sewer of the city, and was dry except during the early and latter rains. Siloam was only a spring without the walls, not always flowing, the contents of which were sometimes sold to the people by measure; and the pools supplied by its puny streams were either used for washing sheep, and similar purposes, rendering them unfit for ceremonial purposes, or they were owned by persons not likely to lend them for washing apostate strangers in. The water used for domestic purposes was obtained from the rains of heaven, and preserved in household tanks, and of course was guarded with the utmost care and used with a rigid economy—it raining there only two seasons in the year. It may be further mentioned that the fountain of Siloam is the only place in the environs of Jerusalem where the traveller can moisten his finger, quench his thirst, and rest his head under the shadow of the cool rock and on two or three tufts of verdure. That the case was precisely similar in the

time of the Apostle," &c., &c. Now we must first notice his first objection—"There was not time enough." We think we shall be able to overthrow this fortification of our opponent, and the fair-minded reader will conclude before he gets through that there is manifested on the part of some Pedo-Baptist writers, either great unfairness or ignorance.

The question is, "Were the three thousand sprinkled or immersed?" "Was there time enough to immerse them all in one day?" Now, it is a fact, that it takes about as long for a Methodist preacher to sprinkle a candidate as it does for a Baptist minister to immerse one; from my observation it consumes more time even, so they defeat their own theory in endeavoring to upset ours. But they give the Apostles 6 hours and say it was impossible to baptize (immerse) them all in that space of time. Dr. Curtis admirably ventilates this objection. He says: "It is painfully little having to discuss questions of time about a matter of this solemn interest; it is an ordinance that is usually prolonged from its pleasant nature. What antiquary ever denied the immersion of ten thousand in one day in the river Swale near the beginning of the seventh century? Or whoever ventured to question that the baptism of the three thousand on Easter eve, A. D., 404, at Constantinople, was by immersion, though disturbed by the officers sent to arrest Chrysostom?" Remigius, Bishop of Rheims, immersed three thousand in one day, A. D., 496, assisted by his clergy. These historical facts are too well established to be at all denied. Dr. Curtis relates a circumstance of his own observation. Twenty-seven persons were immersed in a stream in a most solemn and impressive manner—a scene, he says, so interesting and solemn as never faded from the memories of those who witnessed it, and that the minister immersed the entire twenty-seven candidates in eight minutes. In this way the whole of the three thousand might have been baptized in less than one hour and a quarter by the twelve Apostles. Make the calcula-

tion. But it is probable that the seventy Apostles were also present and aided in this grand scene, "for they were all with one accord in the same place," says the Scripture. This would make eighty-two administrators, and if they were all present, they must all have taken part in this delightful service, for I have never seen a Baptist minister yet who did not regard it a great pleasure to engage in this holy command. Now allowing one minute for one immersion to each one of these 82 administrators—which is twice as long as a Baptist preacher requires now-a-days—and the whole ceremony of immersing the three thousand could have been performed in less than one hour! But the distinguished Dr. Richard Fuller tells us in his work on baptism that he has more than once baptized one and two hundred before morning service on the Lord's day. According to this the twelve Apostles even would have no difficulty in immersing three thousand on the day of Pentecost. It seems to us, therefore, that any objection made by Pedo-Baptists because there was not time enough, is weak indeed and destitute of sound reason.

But before we leave this difficulty in the minds of our opponents, let us hear what a few impartial and distinguished Pedo-Baptists say about this matter. 1st. The learned and sagacious Venema, in his "Ecclesiastical History," fairly states: "It is without controversy, that baptism in the primitive Church was administered by immersion into water and not by sprinkling, seeing John is said to have baptized in Jordan, and where there was much water, as Christ also did by his Disciples in the neighborhood of those places (Matt. iii and John iii). Philip also going down into the water baptized the Eunuch (Acts 8) . . . Nor is there any necessity to have recourse to the idea of sprinkling in our interpretation of Acts II--14, when three thousand souls are said to be added to Christ by baptism, seeing it might be performed by immersion, equally as by sprinkling, especially as they are not said to have

been baptized at the same time . . . The essential act of baptizing in the first and second century, consisted not in sprinkling, but in immersion into water in the name of each person in the Trinity. Concerning immersion the words and phrases that are used sufficiently prove this and that it was performed in a river, a pool, or a fountain. To the essential rites of baptism in the third century, pertained immersion and not sprinkling, except in cases of necessity and then it was accounted a half-perfect baptism. . . Immersion in the fourth century was one of those acts that were considered as essential to baptism." Now the above quotation is from a Pedo-Baptist author, whose fame and reputation for fairness and truth reaches across two Continents, and he says that "there is no proof that the three thousand were baptized by sprinkling, seeing that it might as well have been done by immersion as that was the custom in those times." It looks reasonable that this great and learned man, who was not a Baptist, who had carefully studied the pages of ancient Church history, and looked impartially into the matter, giving his candid and honest opinion and against the practice of his own people, would more likely be received as correct, than the statements of Dr. Hudson, whose fame is confined to the narrow limits of the North Carolina Conference.

Once more, Bishop Bossuet thus expresses it: "It appears not, that the three thousand and the five thousand mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles, who were converted at the first sermons of St. Peter, were baptized any other way than by immersion; and the great number of those converts is no proof that they were baptized by sprinkling as some have conjectured. For, besides that, nothing obliges us to say that they were all baptized on the same day, it is certain that John the Baptist, who baptized no less numbers, seeing all Judea flocked to him, baptized no other way than by dipping, and his example shows us that to baptize a great number of people those places were cho-

sen where there was an abundance of water." We have other similar concessions before us, but surely nothing more is necessary to show there was time enough for immersion in this case.

In the next place we notice the difficulty as to the scarcity of water. Dr. H., as we have seen, says, "That the fountain of Siloam is the only place in the environs of Jerusalem where the traveler can moisten his finger, quench his thirst," &c. This looks like a pretty hard story about water in the great city of the world at that time, and if it were true there would indeed have been great difficulty in the supply of water either for sprinkling or immersion sufficient to refute the Apostle's statement as true. The fact is, our opponents have attempted to prove too much in their eagerness to set up their own theory. There is no trouble to get at the truth—here it is: Within the last fifty years the sacred city has been so explored by surveyors of the highest authority, that a point like this can be settled on data not to be shaken. Dr. Robinson gives us his observations upon Palestine where he personally examined this whole matter with minuteness and care, which the reader will find in his "Biblical Researches," (a valuable Presbyterian work) and from which we learn there was really water enough to have immersed tens of thousands. Refer to pages 479–518. 1st. The pool of Siloam, which Dr. H. says was the only place in which "the traveler could moisten his finger," Dr. Robinson says was fifty-three feet long, eighteen feet broad, nineteen feet deep in parts, with another smaller pool close by. 2nd. "The lower pool of Gihon is five hundred and ninety-two feet long, two hundred and sixty feet broad and varies from 2 to 42 feet deep. It covers more than four acres of ground, is rather a lake than a pool in point of size, its sides having a slope just adapted to a descent for immersion. In this spot alone three thousand, or any number, might have been baptized in one day. There are many other cisterns or pools in

which immersions could have been performed. In all of these places the sides are more or less sloping, so that, unless at the time of some freshet, they whould have been suitable for bathing." "And there was the pool of Bethesda, where the impotent man lay. It had every convenience and suitability for this rite, three hundred and sixty feet long, one hundred and thirty feet broad, seventy-five feet deep in parts but so arranged round its sides as to afford facilities for the baptism of multitudes." There were other pools—the pool of Hezekiah—see II Kings. We learn from II Chronicles that there was "much water in Jerusalem." Nehemiah speaks of the "upper water of Gihon," brought straight down to the west side of the city of David. In Isaiah we read of the "waters of the Lower Pool." In the New Testament, in John, we read of a "pool by the sheep market," and also of "the pool of Siloam," which Dr. H. says is the "only place in the environs of Jerusalem where the traveler can moisten his finger, or quench his thirst!" On the contrary travelers whose veracity has never been doubted, testify to the great amount of water to be found in and around this great city, and the Scriptures themselves give us evidence to the same purport, which together establish the fact that there probably never was a city in the world supplied with a greater quantity of water in proportion to its size. The reader is referred for full satisfaction to the testimony of Josephus, who lived at the same time with our Savior, and in his valuable work gives us the most vivid account of the destruction of Jerusalem, (read it,) also to Dr. Sampson, Barclay, Chase and others who visited in person this sacred city and speak of its abundant supply of water. Bishop Marvin, of the Methodist Church, who recently died in St. Louis, in his very interesting work, "The East by Way of the West" says on page 360 that Jerusalem was a well watered city. He visited that city in person and returned home a short time be-

fore his death. Will Dr. H. question Bishop Marvin's statement?

Will any intelligent reader, after perusing these writers, ever question the sufficiency of water for immersing the three thousand? We repeat, there was time enough to perform the immersion, and water sufficient not only to moisten Dr. Hudson's finger, but to immerse his entire body and thousands more in one day by twelve Baptist ministers.

CHAPTER III.

A Review of Chapter VIII "Methodist Armor," p. 86. "Objections Answered."

1st. "Buried with Him in baptism." "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into His death? Therefore, we are buried with Him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of His death, we shall be also in the likeness of His resurrection." (Romans VI, 3--6. Colos. II--12.) The Dr. then comments as follows: "Our Baptist friends falsely assume that the baptism referred to here means ritual or water baptism, whereas, it clearly refers to a Spiritual baptism." If this be so, Dr. H. refutes his own labored argument on page 80 of his book. There he attempted to prove that "spiritual baptism was by pouring." Says he, "I will pour out my spirit," &c., and then adds, "Now as the Holy Spirit was *poured* upon the people, Peter poured water upon them as the *most fitting mode of baptism.*" He says in another place, "When Peter saw the Holy Spirit poured out, this suggested to him that water baptism must be performed in the same manner." Now hear what Paul says: "We are buried with Him by baptism." Dr. H. sees his difficulty, he is staggered, and instead of coming out, like most eminent Pedo-Baptist divines and honestly admitting that this text teaches the

mode of baptism by immersion only, he stultifies himself by saying that only spiritual baptism is meant, whereas heretofore he maintained that pouring was the manner in which spiritual baptism was performed. How inconsistent these doctors of divinity become in time of danger! At one time the baptism of the Holy Spirit is by *pouring* when it suits his purpose, and now he says "it is represented by a burial" (an immersion) but has no reference to water baptism here. He is certainly hard to please. Now let some of the great Pedo-Baptist authors speak on this point, at whose feet the Dr. and myself might learn wisdom.

Prof. Stuart states that "most commentators have maintained that *burial* here has a necessary reference to the mode of literal baptism which they say was by *immersion*, because immersion *under the water*, may be compared to a *burial under the earth*."

John Wesley, the father of Methodism, in his notes on the New Testament, when commenting on this passage of Rom. 6, says: "Buried with Him by baptism, is an allusion to the ancient manner of baptizing by immersion." Will Dr. Hudson dare repudiate and disown his own father? He can charge the Baptists of falsely assuming that it refers to water baptism, but what will he say when his father and other learned men of his own Church say the same thing?

Joseph Benson, the popular commentator of the same Church says: "We are buried with Him clearly alludes to the ancient mode of baptism by immersion."

The celebrated Dr. Wall, (an Episcopalian) says: "This passage (Rom. 6-4) fixes the question that in ancient baptism the whole body was put under the water."

Dr. Samuel Clarke: "We are buried with Christ by baptism, &c. In the primitive times the manner of baptizing was by immersion. It was a very significant emblem of the dying and rising again, referred to by St. Paul in the above passage."

The Westminister Assembly of Divines, consisting of fifty eminent ministers, on Romans 6–4: "In this phrase, the Apostle seemeth to allude to the ancient mode of baptism, which was to dip the parties baptized, and as it were, bury them under water."

I have before me the evidence of many others, both of modern and ancient writers, who, with remarkable unanimity, testify to the truthful assumption of Baptists on this passage. In the face of the united testimony of so many learned commentators and authors, who are not Baptists, some recent writers blindly and deliberately endeavor to mislead their readers, and "like the blind leading the blind" must inevitably fall together in the ditch. Dr. Hudson can't see water baptism in this plain word of the inspired Apostle; he would not believe it "though one should rise from the dead" and tell him that immersion alone was practiced by the Apostles. He says: "No reference whatever to the mode of baptism is found here. It is the *sound* more than the *sense* that strikes our Baptist brethren." He then gives us some quotations from "leading Baptist writers," as he says, who disown the above passage as referring to water baptism, and concludes: "Hence the entire argument, founded on these passages, in favor of dipping, vanishes in a moment." Now, we do not wish to seem so impolite as to call in question the veracity of our friend, but any Baptist who reads this assertion will smile at Dr. Hudson's credulity and pity rather than be angry at his weak and groundless proofs to establish his sinking cause.

On page 87 of "The Methodist Armor," the reader will find one of the most remarkable statements ever made by a Christian writer. Not being satisfied that his arguments already adduced were sufficient to disprove the idea of water baptism in the passage, "We are buried with Him by baptism," he here gravely denies that Christ was "buried" at all. He says, "His precious body was carried into a

room hewn out of a rock and laid upon a side bench. In this process there was not the slightest resemblance to dipping a person under water, no more than when the body of Dorcas was carried up stairs and laid upon a bed. And he must be sadly at a loss for valid evidence in aid of immersion who seizes on this allusion to uphold his practice." We imagine the pious Christian who reads the above remarkable statement of a minister of the Gospel, that the Savior was not BURIED, that his body was taken and laid on a SIDE BENCH, will turn away in disgust and sorrow from such sacreligious allusions to the final termination of our Redeemer's earthly career. It is almost a wonder that our friend admitted that Christ ever died at all, in his eagerness to find some excuse for denying immersion was the mode of His baptism. It savors more of mockery than of an honest inquiry for truth. Were it not that some infatuated admirer failed to see it in this light, it would be passed over in silent contempt.

Hear what the Evangelists say: "Then took they the body of Jesus and wound it in linen clothes with the spices, as the manner of the Jews is to bury. Now, in the place where he was crucified there was a garden; and in the garden a new sepulchre wherein was never man laid. There they laid Jesus." John XIX-40-42. And chapter XX-5: "And he (the disciple) *stooping down*, and looking in saw the linen clothes lying," &c. And verse 11: "But Mary stood without, weeping, and as she wept she *stooped down* and looked into the sepulchre." Again, Luke XXIV-12: "Then arose Peter, and ran unto the sepulchre, and stooping down he beheld the linen clothes laid by themselves." Matthew and Mark also state that they laid the body of Jesus in the sepulchre. Matthew calls it a *tomb*, chapter 27, verse 60. Our English dictionaries define a sepulchre to mean "a burial place," "the place where a corpse is buried," "a grave," "a tomb." (See Worcester Unabridged.)

The Psalmist in his prophecy of Christ, chapter XVI-10:

"Because thou wilt not leave my soul in *hell* (grave), neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption." See also Acts, II-27. See also Isaiah LIII-9: ""He made his grave with the wicked." Paul says: "We are buried with Christ," &c. The Savior said he would be buried. Matt. XXVI-12, also XII-40. Paul says he was buried. I Cor. XV-3-4. But Dr. Hudson says Christ was not buried, that his body was simply laid up on "A SIDE BENCH." And yet the Scriptures tell us that the disciple, Peter, and the women ran unto the sepulchre. and "*stooping down*," (looking down into the grave) to see if his body was still down there where they saw him buried, laid in the "tomb," &c. We are not told they looked *up* on the "*side bench*" to see if he was up there. No, this may suit our friend's wild imagination but robs the grave of all its solemnity and takes away the resurrection. Whatever he may prove in other places, here he fails sadly to make out his case and is clearly non suited.

But let us recur to the natural and Scriptural meaning of this burial, before we dismiss this topic. There are three MONUMENTAL INSTITUTIONS in the Christian religion, given to commemorate the grandest events connected with the history of our Savior while on earth. First, the Lord's day is commemorative of His resurrection. Not a single first day of the week has since transpired, not one week since the first constitution of the Christian Church, without the celebration of the Lord's supper or the administration of his word before the great assemblies. Thus the Sabbath became a great and perpetual monument of Christ's resurrection, and with great unanimity is observed to this day by all denominations of Christians.

2nd. The monumental institution of Baptism. While the Lord's day commemorates merely the time of the resurrection, this institution commemorates his burial and resurrection. Jesus died, was buried and rose again. So we die unto all authority and hope save that of our Lord

Jesus, the Messiah, and consequently unto sin, in this act. We, as all dead persons are, are then buried with Christ for a short time, lie for a short time in the earth, and we for a short time in the water. We also rise with him; He rose from the dead and we rise from our death unto sin, to walk and live and rejoice in a new life, He having been delivered for our offences and raised for our justification.

From the day of Pentecost till now not a year, week or day has passed without the repetition of this commemorative institution. Till the council of Ravenna, till the reign of Queen Elizabeth in England, this ordinance was significant of the burial and resurrection of Jesus Christ. For every time we see a person buried in the water and raised out of it by the power of another we see Jesus emblematically buried and raised again. Many millions continue to submit voluntarily to this monumental institution and publishing, without uttering a word to the spectator, the death, burial and resurrection of Jesus. What a wonderfully contrived institution is this, which by positive acts, and which no mode of reasoning could have suggested, keeps itself forever standing before the eyes of men! Christ crucified, dead, buried, risen again, ascending, exhibited in all its sacred acts of worship. In our prayers we speak to Him, in our praises we speak of Him, in our positive acts of worship commemorate Him, and in our immersion we imitate Him. How poor and feeble and meaningless do sprinkling and pouring represent Christ in any sense whatever! Is not my friend fully answered on his objection to this declaration of St. Paul?

3rd. The other monumental act of our Saviour is "The Last Supper." This represents his "broken body and shed blood." The emblems are bread, which he broke and divided with his Disciples and reminded them how his body was to be bruised and broken, and the wine, as he poured it into the cup and assured them, in like manner must his own blood be spilled for the redemption of sinful man. He

notified them as often as they did this, (i. e.) engaged in this Holy exercise, they commemorated his suffering and death. So we are commanded to observe the Sabbath day and keep it holy; to follow Him in baptism, emblematical of his burial and resurrection, as well as to commemorate his death before the world by often assembling ourselves together around His table.

2. "The baptism of Christ," page 88, of the "Armor." Dr. H. says: "'Following Christ into the water,' 'Going down into the liquid grave,' 'Being buried with the Savior beneath Jordan's rolling waves,' are clap-trap words of much sound but little sense. If you follow Christ strictly in baptism you must wait till you are thirty years old, for he was not baptized until he had reached that age. What was the design of Christ's baptism? Christ furnishes the answer: 'It becometh us to fulfil all righteousness.' To fulfil righteousness is to be obedient to law. This law was not the moral, but the law respecting the High Priesthood. The baptism of Christ was the public, formal inauguration and consecration of Him to His priestly ministry. The consecration of Aaron to the High Priesthood was by washing, anointing and consecration. Observe how this typical law was completely fulfilled by Christ. Ist. He was washed by baptism. (Could not quite get Him sprinkled here, but washed Him this time.) 2nd. He was anointed by the Holy Ghost. 3rd. And then consecrated to the priestly office. Thus we see that Christ was a High Priest. That He was called of God to this office as was Aaron. That He was ordained and consecrated to the office of High Priest for ever more, that He might offer both gifts and sacrifices for sin."

Now I have here given the reader the benefit of Dr. Hudson's almost entire chapter on "The Baptism of Christ." It is truly a logical curiosity. Here our friend is perfectly at sea, without compass, rudder or ballast. He sets out by saying, "Following Christ into the water," "Going

down into the liquid grave," "Being buried with the Savior," &c., "are clap-trap words of much sound and little sense." He finds it easier to ridicule the plain teachings of the Bible than to reply to arguments which he cannot refute. He then runs off, away from the simple narrative of this sublime act of Christ, and talks about "Aaron" and the "Priesthood," and the "Holy Ghost," says Christ was "washed by baptism," and then "consecrated to his priestly office." Let us come back and see how the Evangelists talk about Christ's Baptism. Matt. III. "Then cometh Jesus from Gallilee to Jordan unto John to be baptized of him. But John forbade Him, saying I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me? And Jesus answering said unto him, Suffer it to be so now: for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness. Then he suffered Him. And Jesus when He was baptized, WENT UP STRAIGHTWAY OUT OF THE WATER." So also Mark 1–9, "Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee, and was baptized of John IN JORDAN. And straightway *coming up out of the water*," &c. How plain is this language. Dr. Hudson's flat-headed Indian could easily comprehend its meaning. Nothing here about Aaron and the High Priesthood, not the *least* intimation of pouring or sprinkling. These passages are so obvious that it ought not to require an additional word to satisfy every reader that Christ the Redeemer was immersed. Turn and read the account in Matthew and Mark, and then read Dr. Hudson's articles on these passages and you will see that they are as wide apart as the North and South poles.

Is it reasonable that the Holy Spirit should have written that Christ was baptized "*in Jordan*," and that "*He came up straightway out of the water*," that John would go to the river Jordan and baptize his subjects in that stream, unless the mode were immersion? Surely, the man that can see either sprinkling our pouring in this transaction is unwilling to see the truth. When Pedo-Baptists

endeavor to get round this overwhelming truth of Christ's immersion in Jordan, they tell us, as Dr. H. does, that it was simply His initiation into *His priestly office*. But Christ belonged to the tribe of Judah, and not to the tribe of Levi to which the priestly office was confined. Again: Christ was made a priest after the order of Melchisedec and not after the order of Aaron. There is not the least intimation that baptism had any connection with the Priesthood. The man who would make Christ's baptism a priestly consecration must deny the Scriptures of Inspiration.

The rite which John administered to Christ was precisely the one he administered to all who came to him and were baptized in the same river. Christ had nothing to repent of. "He knew no sin." There was no symbolically washing away of sin in his case. His baptism signified his obedience to law, for he said: "Thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness," and as Dr. Campbell has it, "To satisfy every institution." "He entered the stream and was buried beneath the waters as an emblem of his future grave," says a distinguished writer. Says another writer: "We never find that Jesus speaks of himself in the plural number, and it must therefore be allowed that here he meant John and all his followers. 'It becometh us' to walk in all his ordinances and commands, to follow his example in going down into the water, and not say to ourselves, some other way will do as well."

Whitsins says: "Our Lord would be baptized that He might conciliate authority to John; that by His own example He might commend and sanctify our baptism; that by His baptism He might represent the future condition both of Himself and His followers: first humble, then glorious; now mean and low, then glorious and exalted; *that* represented by IMMERSION, *this* by EMERSION—and finally to declare by His voluntary submission to baptism, that He would not delay the delivering up of Himself to be immersed in the torrents of hell, yet with a certain faith and hope of

emerging." This beautiful and impressive sentence is the language of one of the most learned and pious Pedo-Baptist writers who ever lived.

Dr. Hudson may talk about "Following Christ into the water," "Going down into the liquid grave," &c., as "clap-trap words of much sound but little sense," yet he may find it a Herculean task to convince the pious reader of the New Testament, unbiased with party zeal, that it is not his duty to follow the example of Christ by "going down into the water."

Dr. Hudson may go on and talk about the High Priesthood, the Levites and the Rabbis and Aaron, and all that, to draw the mind of his readers from this simple narrative of our Savior's baptism in the river Jordan. He may, like the scuttle fish, muddy the waters in which to make his escape, but all in vain; he is caught in his own devices; for while he denies that Christ was immersed, he is not quite brave enough to affirm that he was either sprinkled or poured. He rather inclines to a new mode, for, says he, "He was washed by baptism," tho' he does not say whether He washed Himself or whether John did it. But is it not strange that Jesus should travel such a great distance to get to John just to have a little water applied to him? He was in the city of Nazareth, (see Mark 1, 9,) in Gallilee, a distance of many miles from Jordan; it required a journey of three days to reach the place where John was baptizing in Bethabara.—John 1–28. See our Savior proceeding on his long journey to reach the river Jordan, to make an exhibition of Himself before the multitude in the act of baptism, and to proclaim to the world his mission on earth. How sublime the scene! The Son of God, the Lord of heaven, the righteous Judge of the last day, the author of our salvation, the giver of eternal life, standing before his servant on the banks of the beautiful river of so many remarkable events, and demanding baptism at his hands! John saw Him approaching and called out: "Behold the Lamb

of God which taketh away the sin of the world!" He knew his Master at once, but was astonished to hear Him demand that He, too, must be plunged in Jordan's waters, that John must administer the ordinance to Him as he was doing to all who professed faith in Him, "confessing their sins." "But John forbade Him, saying, I have need to be baptized of Thee." Still he must yield to the command, "Suffer it to be so now." "And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water." A voice from heaven is heard; His Father owns His Son in this His first act of humiliation; the people look on in wonder as they hear the voice: "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased."

Ah, reader, have you not witnessed many similar scenes at the baptismal waters? Often on such solemn occasions have we witnessed the falling tears of the spectators, even from the hardest-hearted, at the sight of a number of young Christians going down into the stream, there offering themselves in this impressive way, before the world, to their Lord and Master. I could here appeal to the consciences of thousands of serious Christians who received their first convictions of the reality of religion. I have witnessed the immersion of hundreds of professed believers, always attended with weeping and solemnity upon the part of the spectators, but the writer does not remember ever to have seen anything of the kind attendant upon the sprinkling of babies or the pouring water upon adults, and it always had the appearance more of mockery than of solemnity. These facts ought forever to silence the charges of INDECENCY from our opponents!

But not to weary the reader we will now notice Dr. Hudson's next Article:

3rd. "JOHN BAPTIZING IN JORDAN," PAGE 89. 1st. "It is believed," says Dr. H., "that *immersing* persons in Jordan was altogether impracticable." Our author then proceeds to show that here there was too much water to

perform the ordinance by *immersion;* that the river was too deep. He quotes Thorn, Volney, Shaw and others to prove that Jordan's waters were too rapid and dangerous for immersion. 2nd. He says: "Judging then, from the places chosen and the fonts constructed by our opponents, and indeed from the nature of the case, (unless men and women in John's time were twice as tall as at the present day!) I contend that dipping persons in the Jordan was altogether impracticable, and unhesitatingly conclude that they were only *affused* or *sprinkled with the water of it.*"

Our friend is exceedingly unreasonable in the management of this controversy. He insisted that the three thousand could not have been immersed at Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost. Why? Because water was too scarce; there was *no river* there. So also, in the case of Paul and the jailer, and Cornelius, immersion could not have been the mode in those places, for there were no streams there, not enough at Jerusalem for a "*traveler to moisten his finger.*" And now when he comes to John, baptizing in the river Jordan, he would have his readers believe there was *too much water,* too deep for baptismal purposes, except by pouring or sprinkling, unless the men and women were all giants in those days, i. e. "twice as tall as they are now." So if there is no mention of a "river" in the baptismal narrative in the Scriptures, immersion is out of the question, "*not water enough!*" If the river Jordan is named the same cry of no immersion is heard, "*too much water.*" So that, according to the logic of our friend, a scarcity of water and an abundance of water prove the same thing. How are we to meet such silly arguments? Why is not a little common sense brought to bear on the minds of men engaged in religious controversy? Our opponents are hard to please. Like the Jewish children in the markets, "If we pipe to them they will not dance; if we mourn they will not lament." Why, we ask in all can-

dor, should Dr. H. admit that immersion is held by the Methodists to be "equally valid with pouring and sprinkling," and yet labor so hard to prove that it is not recognized in the Bible? Surely if men would only divest themselves of prejudice, make truth their guiding principle. Christianity would not be rent and torn by factions and parties to the damage of our common religion.

The learned and pious Dr. G. Campbell, says that John baptized (immersed) Christ in Jordan, (en Jordane) and adds: "It is to be regretted that we have so much evidence that even good and learned men allow their judgment to be warped by the sentiments and customs of the sect which they prefer." How true! It is this spirit of party zeal which is the fruitful source of the great mass of error, and which causes our Methodist brethren to cling to it with undying energy.

Another Pedo-Baptist writer of distinction, Dr. Adam Clarke, says: "The baptism of John was by plunging the body."

Dr. Macknight, that great Presbyterian, writes: "Christ was *buried under water* by John."

Lieutenant Lynch, of the American navy, about the year 1849, made a survey of the river Jordan from its source to where it empties into the Dead Sea, and soon thereafter published the most authentic account ever given of that sacred river, which doubtless my friend, Dr. H., has read. I make the following extract from that interesting book. The bathing of the pilgrims in the Jordan presents a scene so strangely wild and exciting as to justify the insertion of the following graphic description of it:

"At 3, a. m., we were aroused by the intelligence that the pilgrims were coming. Rising in haste we beheld thousands of torchlights, with a dark mass beneath, moving rapidly over the hills. Striking our tents we hurriedly removed them with all our effects to the left. We had scarcely finished when they were upon us; men, women and chil-

dren, mounted on camels, horses, mules and donkeys, rushed impetuously by towards the bank. * * * * The party which had disturbed us was the advance guard of the great body of pilgrims which was thought to be about eight thousand. At 5, just at the dawn of day, the last made its appearance, coming over the crest of a high ridge, in one tumultuous and eager throng. In all the wild haste of a disorderly rout, Copts, Russians, Poles, Armenians Greeks and Syrians, from all parts of Asia, from Europe, from Africa, and from far distant America, on they came; men, women and children of every age and in every variety of costume; talking, screaming, shouting in almost every known language under the sun. * * * Dismounting in haste, and disrobing with precipitation, they rushed down the bank, and *threw themselves into the stream.* Each one plunged himself, or was *dipped by another, three times* below the surface, in honor of the Trinity, and then filled a bottle, or some other utensil, from the river. The bathing dress of many of the pilgrims was a white gown with a black cross upon it. Most of them, as soon as they were dressed, cut branches of the *agnus castus*, or willow, and dipping them in the consecrated stream, bare them away as memorials of their visit." So we see Lieutenant Lynch, who was not writing a book about Church ordinances, and who saw with his own eyes this river so much in my friend's way, forever silences the objection to its being too deep for John's baptism. For the location above described is at the river where it is supposed those grand scenes took place in the time of our Savior.

If, as Lieutenant Lynch states, men, women and children could plunge themselves into the river, thousands at the same time and place, and "dip" themselves or others in its waters, how does my friend get this wild notion that the ordinance of baptism by immersion could not have been performed, "unless people in those days were twice as tall as they are now?"

One or two more authorities will conclude this part of the argument.

Tertullian, who lived near the time of the Apostle John, expressly mentions that the people were dipped by *John in Jordan.*

Olshousen, the great German Reformed commentator, says that John baptized in Jordan, "because deep water, adapted for immersion, was there."

We might add many more concessions of the most celebrated writers both of ancient and modern times who do not hesitate to declare that John's baptism was by immersion. But our friend Dr. H., and many who blindly follow his method of reasoning, reject the testimony, however strong and unanswerable, which tends to subvert their own unfounded notions." "Convinced against their will, they are of the same opinion still." It is useless, therefore, to say another word about the deep waters of Jordan. We proceed then to his next position, which is this:

3rd. "That John's baptism was not by immersion is clear from the *vast number* baptized by him; that the population of Palestine at the time of John's ministry, could not be less than six millions." He further argues from the Bible: "There went out unto him all the land of Judea, and they of Jerusalem, and all the region round about Jordan, confessing their sins." From this he concludes that John baptized three millions, one-half the population; that John's ministry lasted only about ten months. He allows "six hours a days and six days a week for baptizing," and upon this calculation, shows that John had to baptize two thousand and two hundred each hour. "And this calculation shows the utter impossibility of its being done by immersion." Now if the reader will turn and read from page 159 to 172 in the Methodist Discipline he will discover that it requires a much longer period of time for a Methodist minister to sprinkle a child or man than it does for a Baptist minister to immerse his candidate; he

will there see that the ceremony required for the child takes up *five* pages, and for adults *eight* pages; he will see a long list of questions asked of the candidate commencing with, "Dost thou renounce the devil and all his works, the vain pomp and glory of the world, with all covetous desires of the same, and the carnal desires of the flesh, so that thou will not follow or be led by them?" ANSWER. "I renounce them all," and so on, too long to repeat here; and some half dozen different forms of prayer are offered by the minister, including the reading of portions of the New Testament. If John used anything like this form of ceremony before he could sprinkle the people, the objection as to time in baptizing Dr. Hudson's "three millions" will come with tenfold more force against his theory than against the Baptists.

If, as Dr. H. says, it was utterly impossible to be done by immersion, how is it possible for him to show that it could be done in any "decent" manner by sprinkling? Some of Dr. Hudson's friends get over the difficulty in this way. Dr. Guise, for instance, when speaking of the multitude baptized by our Lord's harbinger, says: "It seems to me, therefore, that the people stood in ranks near to or just in the edge of the river, and John passing along before them cast water upon their heads or faces with his hands, or some proper instrument; by which means he might easily baptize many thousand in a day." (See Mr. Martin's letters to Mr. Horsey, page 145-6.)

Dr. Arch. Hale gives his sanction to Dr. Guise's plan; so does Horsey, who also says: "I presume that the multitude stood in ranks at the brink, or just in the edge of the river, while the minister sprinkled or poured the running water upon them." (See Infant Baptism, Stated and Defended, page 20.)

In this way the calculation made by Dr. H. that "two thousand and two hundred must be baptized each hour, for six hours in each of six days in the week and for ten

successive months, the end of John's ministry, to complete his baptism of the three millions." Dr. Hudson says it was "utterly impossible for it to have been done by immersion," and his brother, Dr. Guise, shows us how it could have been done by sprinkling. The fact is, I think Dr. H. did not see into what difficulty he was running in making out this vast number as an objection to immersion, but breaks down without giving us any intimation how it could be done by sprinkling and left it to the reader's imagination. And how so grave an author as Dr. Guise should give such a puerile and farcical turn to the conduct of the Forerunner of Christ when administering a solemn ordinance of divine worship is a matter of wonder. Nor can we account for its being approved by others, but on a supposition that they feel themselves embarrassed, when attempting to reconcile their own practice with the natural meaning of the language of the Scripture.

"If," says a great writer, "the credit of sprinkling cannot be supported without burlesquing the Sacred history and exposing in this manner one of the most exalted human characters to the ridicule of the world, it ought forever to sink into oblivion." Look at the picture they draw of the son of Zacharias, who was sent to prepare the way of the Lord. See him standing in the edge of the river, and, with his naked hand, a squirt, a brush, or a bunch of hyssop, sprinkling the multitude as they "stood in ranks" along the bank—"two thousand and two hundred every hour in the day for six hours, and six days in every week for ten months," for this is Dr. Hudson's calculation. Does my grave and intelligent Christian friend believe any such farce?

According to these authors, there was not half the solemnity in John's baptism, that there is in that annual festival of the Romish Church called "The Benediction of Horses." Dr. Middleton says that "this is always celebrated with much solemnity in the month of January when the

inhabitants of the city and neighborhood, send up their horses and other animals to the convent of St. Anthony, near St. Mary the Great, where a priest in his surplice at the church door, sprinkles with his brush all the animals singly as they are presented to him, and receives from each owner a gratuity in proportion to their zeal and ability. Amongst the rest I had my own horse blest at the expense of about eighteen pence of our money, as well to satisfy my own curiosity as to humor the coachman."

So we see the priest in his white robe appears to act with more care, more solemnity than the servant of God in his hairy garments. For the priest, tho' paid for his labor at so much per head, cautiously sprinkles the cattle one by one, while John, (according to Dr. Guise), being in a hurry to finish his blessing, "passing along before the multitude as they stood in ranks, cast water upon their heads or faces with his hands, or some proper instrument, by which means he might baptize many thousand in a day!" And according to Dr. Hudson's calculation he would have to "apply" the water to thirteen thousand and two hundred every day (Sundays excepted) for ten months! Now how many ranks deep the people stood these authors have not informed us, yet there was more than one, for they use the plural, ranks, and if the water was cast on them by some "instrument" or even with the hands, scooped up from the running river, it would have been very unequally divided among the candidates, some receiving more, some less, and the rear rank scarcely any at all. But our authors say nothing about the children in this great multitude—the infants. Why are they silent on this point and at this particular time? Why should they leave out the infants here, and so strenuously insist they were in the jailer's family, Lydia's, Cornelius' and others? It is true the infants could not stand in ranks, nor could the administrator take them into his arms one by one, for according to their representation, time would not permit; but then the parents could

take them in their arms, so as to receive some of the water as it was "cast" upon them. Why they are so silent about the children in this vast multitude we cannot imagine.

Then our Savior came to John as he was baptizing in the river Jordan, and demanded baptism for himself. Will our authors inform us whether he, too, was standing in the edge of the water in the front rank and had some of the water thrown into his face, as it was cast upon the multitude from a brush, a bunch of hyssop, or some instrument in the hands of John? For Dr. H. asserts he could not have been immersed in the river Jordan, for the water was too deep, unless both the Savior and the administrator were "twice as tall as men are now."

To place Dr. Hudson's argument in its proper light of Jordan's having too much water, we will use Dr. Mills' anecdote in his reply to Dr. Summers. He says: "Diedrich Knickerbocker, in one of the interior towns of New York, is reported to have cut a large hole under his barn door for the large cat to pass through and a small hole by its side to give access to the little cat, thinking, I suppose—since you have thrown light upon it—that the larger orifice was altogether too large for the little cat to pass through!"

But we will not pursue this ridiculous farce any farther. When men are pressed with plain Scripture, which militates against principles instilled in their minds from infancy, they resort to all sorts of inventions rather than surrender their predjudices to truth. Let us now turn back and see the natural, plain and easy import of this matter of John's baptism which troubles our Methodist brethren so much. The Evangelists say: "Jerusalem and all Judea and all the region round about Jordan went to him and were baptized," but they do not say all the people went; it was the places, that is, each place was there represented. Just as we say, "North Carolina voted for Gov. Scales in the last election," yet who does not know that only a small part of the inhabitants voted for him? Just so Matthew says,

"Jerusalem came," that is, a great many people from Jerusalem and Judea, and the country round about Jordan came; these places were fully represented. Besides, John did not baptize all who came. He positively refused the Pharisees and the Sadducees, and they composed a large majority of the Jewish nation. Where Dr. Hudson gets his idea that John baptized three millions we know not; most certainly nowhere in the Bible.

Again the sacred writer says that "Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John," and when the disciples were gathered together after His death there does not seem to have been a great multitude. For although great multitudes came to John and multitudes followed Christ, yet comparatively few brought forth fruit to justify baptism. Why, then, should men of sense go off into such wild imagination and talk about the impossibility of one man's baptizing three millions in ten months just to get clear of the idea of immersion, and still claim that it is "equally valid with sprinkling or pouring?" The Holy Ghost says John *immersed* them, (for the word itself in the original language means that, and nothing else) and it is not for us poor mortals to say that was "*impossible*" and then make ourselves ridiculous in the eyes of the world in trying to maintain our false assumptions.

Prof. Wm. Smith, in his New Bible Dictionary, which lies before me, says: "The language of the New Testament and of the primitive fathers sufficiently points to immersion as the common mode of baptism." This is high authority from a Pedo-Baptist, and at present Classical Examiner in the University of London and editor of the Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities. Is not our friend fully answered on these points?

The next position our author takes is that "John's baptism is not Christian baptism."—Pages 90 and 91.

Here we would remark: Unless John really immersed, why do our Methodist brethren so diligently labor to prove

that John's baptism was not Christian? Or why are they so anxious to establish that the baptism of our Savior was not an example for us unless He were truly immersed? They would never be troubled about taking Jesus as our example if it did not result in immersion.

As this last topic has but little to do with our present discussion, we need not spend much time in noticing it here.

"John's baptism was not Christian baptism," says Dr. Hudson, and yet he does not attempt to give us one word of information as to the object of his baptism. If it be not Christian baptism the reader would naturally inquire: What was it then? If John baptized Christ what else could it be but *Christian* baptism? Is not Christ the author of Christianity? And did not John live under the Christian dispensation? Mark calls his ministry "The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ." This was the introduction of the New Testament dispensation.

Joseph Benson, the well known Methodist Commentator, says: "The gospel of Jesus Christ began with the preaching and baptism of John the Baptist."

Luke says: "The law and the prophets were until John; since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it."

Peter, in Acts I-21, asserts the same truth. John's mission was divine. He was "sent from God." He was the first Christian preacher under this new dispensation. "The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God." John I-6-7: "There was a man sent from God whose name was John; the same came to be a witness of the Light, that all men through him might believe." In him was fulfilled the prophesy of Isaiah. Matt. III-3: "For this is he that was spoken of by the prophet Esaias, saying, The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight." John preached the baptism of repentance to all the people of Israel, Acts XIII-24. "Then went out to him Jerusalem,

and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan, and were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins," Matt. III-5-6. You see he baptized none who would not "confess their sins." The Savior had none to confess. "He knew no sin," therefore John baptized Him, also, in Jordan, in obedience to His command. The great object of John's ministry was to "prepare the way of the Lord," to proclaim repentance, to announce the immediate approach of the long promised Messiah. His commission was from heaven and he informed his hearers that the same God who sent him to prepare the way of the Lord, "sent him to baptize with water," Jonn I-33, and this too was preparatory to the ministry of Christ. Baptism, then, as a divine institution, was unknown previous to the mission of John.

Now hear what that great commentator, Matthew Henry, says about John: "See what sure grounds John went upon his ministry and baptism. He had a warrant from heaven for what he did. He did not run without sending; God sent him to baptize; God gave him both his mission and his message; both his credentials and instructions," (Expos. on Jno. I-6-14.) I repeat again: If John's baptism was not Christian, it devolves on Dr. H. and his Methodist brethren to show what it was.

Mr. Erskine says: "John's baptism was termed the baptism of repentance, and baptism to repentance; because he required of ALL whom he admitted to baptism a profession of repentance and exhorted them to such a conduct as would demonstrate their repentance genuine."

Rev. Mr. Scott, Presbyterian, says: "It does not appear that any but adults were baptized by John. Adult Jews, professing repentance and a disposition to become the Messiah's subjects, were the ONLY PERSONS whom John admitted to baptism." (Comment on Matt. iii-5-6.)

Mr. Burkitt: "John's baptism was the baptism of repentance of which infants were incapable." (Expos. notes on Matt. xix-13-15.)

Now hear what the Redeemer says of John: "For this is he of whom it is written, Behold, I send my messenger before thy face which shall prepare thy way before thee. Verily I say unto you, Among them that are born of women there hath not arisen a greater than John the Baptist."—(Matt. xi-10-11.) And now see how He answers this question of John's baptism: "And Jesus answered and said unto them, I will also ask you one question, The baptism of John, was it from heaven, or of men? Answer me. And they reasoned among themselves, saying, If we shall say from heaven, he will say, Why then did you not believe him? But if we shall say, of men; all the people will stone us; (they feared the people) for all men counted John that he was a prophet indeed. And they answered and said unto Jesus, We cannot tell."—Mark xi-29.

Again we ask our author: The baptism of John, was it Christian, or was it man's institution? Will he answer? The founder of Presbyterianism, John Calvin, shall answer: "For myself I grant that the baptism they had received was the *true baptism of John*, and the *very same* with the baptism of Christ, but I deny that they were *baptized again*."

Dr. Knapp says that "the baptism of John and the Messiah *was one and the same institute* of God himself; that the design was the same inasmuch as it had the same regard to repentance of the candidates and their faith in Christ, whether about to come, or having already come."

But Dr. H says, page 91: "John's baptism was not *initiatory* into the Church. It did not admit them into the Old Testament Church, since those who received it (being Jews) were already members of that Church by circumcision. It did not admit them into the Christian Church, since that Church had not been established." He then concludes this subject by saying: "It is rendered still more evident from the fact that Paul *re-baptized* certain persons at Ephesus who had received John's baptism."—Acts 19-5.

He here leaves us to conjecture what object the evangelists could possibly have in saying anything at all about the baptism of John. He says, "It was utterly impossible to have been immersion;" he says "it is certain that it was not Christian baptism," and he tells us it had no connection with the Old Testament Church; that neither he nor his disciples were members of the Christian Church till they were re-baptized? Is Dr. Hudson's conscience easy now, since he has disposed of the Son of Zacharias in this summary manner? Christ says, "Among them that are born of women, there hath not arisen a *greater* than John the Baptist," and Dr. Hudson on the other hand would have us believe that John was *just nobody at all.* Why should a doctor of divinity, and one who presides over so large and intelligent a body of Christians, so trifle with the word of God?

It is not necessary to detain the reader about Paul's re-baptizing some of John's disciples; great and learned men of all denominations deny that there was any re-baptism taught in the 19th chapter of Acts. One thing is certain, these persons were never baptized by John, for he had been dead about twenty-five years, as the record shows, when Paul was preaching at Ephesus. They said they were baptized "unto John's baptism," *not by John.* John could not have baptized them, for they had not even "so much as heard," of the Holy Ghost, while John, we know, was "full of the Holy Ghost," and taught the people that the Savior would baptize into the Holy Ghost. But all this is foreign to the subject of our discussion, viz: The proper mode of baptism. If the Scriptures teach that sprinkling, or pouring, is the proper mode, then we should practice it; but if *immersion,* then we should certainly hold to this, for there can be but one mode. "One Lord, one Faith, one Baptism." Eph. IV, 5.

We ask the reader now to accompany us to Dr. Hudson's last strong-hold on page 91 of the Methodist Armor.

and carefully and impartially give us a hearing while we attempt a fair and candid review of this his last chapter as to the mode of baptism.

4th. "BAPTO AND BAPTIZO." Says he: "The argument of the immersionists is: '*My position is that baptizo always signifies to dip, never expressing anything but mode.*'"—Dr. Carson. He then proceeds: "The hinge on which the whole argument turns, is that the classic meaning of the terms, Bapto and Baptizo, is always but one thing, *to dip, immerse.* Can this be established? No. Let us see. Dr. Dale, (a learned divine of England) renders Bapto dip, fourteen times; dye, fourteen times; imbue, seven times; temper, one time; stain, one time; wash, four times; moisten, two times; wet, one time—forty-seven. Of these forty-seven cases as rendered by him we have: 1st. Thirty-three against fourteen for dip. 2nd. In no case was there an immersion, i. e. sinking."

We will pause here, and see if this definition given by our friend's author will avail him anything in establishing either sprinkling or pouring. He admits fourteen of the forty-seven mean to dip, so here there is no dispute, for no one can be immersed without being dipped. Thus far he is correct. Next "dye, fourteen times." He of course has reference here to coloring cloth and other articles, and did our friend never witness how this is done? How the old lady dips her yarn, her cloth into the fluid, in order to dye it? Can it be done otherwise? It must be dipped deep down into the liquid and then raised out again, before it can be dyed. Is this not true? No dipping—no dyeing! Here then his own author is in our favor fourteen times more, which make twenty-eight of the forty-seven. Next case. "Imbue, seven times." What does this word imbue mean? Refer to the English dictionaries, and you will see it means nearly the same as to dye. Worcester says, "To tinge deeply—to dye." "Clothes imbued with black cannot afterwards be dyed with a lighter color." (Boyle.) Why?

Because it has been dipped in coloring fluid until it is overwhelmed with black, so completely as not to admit of a change of color. Again: we sometimes hear of the murderer imbuing his hands in the blood of his victim—that is, dipped in his blood, &c. So here again we have seven more, which added to the twenty-eight make thirty-five cases in our favor. Next. "Temper, one time." And how does the smith temper his iron or steel, unless he dips or plunges it in water? Score one more for us. "Stain, one time." Here, too, our dictionaries render this word from the Latin *tingo*, to stain, to *dye*, to color, &c., conveying the same idea in a modified sense, so while we cannot clain this definition on our side, it certainly has no resemblance to sprinkling or pouring. "Wash, four times." Everybody knows we cannot wash without immersing the object to be washed in the water. When we wash our hands, our clothes, we dip them in water. This gives us forty. "Moisten, two times;" and "wet, one time." These last, we admit, may be accomplished either by being dipped or sprinkled. We dip a sponge in water to moisten or wet it; we also sprinkle water on clothes to moisten or wet them. So instead of fourteen we have forty-three definitions of this writer in our favor, to four against us. And it is remarkable that Dr. H. should bring out this author, Dr. Dale, who does not give sprinkling or pouring the first time as a definition of this word *bapto*. Now take the vote—43 for immersion, 4 doubtful, total 47.

But as Dr. Hudson has selected the above quotation from "Dr. Dale," (which proves nothing in his favor), we here give him one from Prof. Moses Steuart's learned work upon this controverted subject. The reputation of this learned professor among Pedo-Baptist scholars and divines is so great, that Dr. Rosser, of the Methodist Church, in his work on baptism, holds this language concerning him: "The judgment of Prof. Steuart, as a Biblical critic, is of the highest reputation in the United States." Here is

what he says:—(see page 298,)—"What are the classical meanings of bapto and baptizo? Both these words mean to dip, to immerse, to plunge into anything liquid. All lexicographers of any note, and critics, are agreed in this." And again on page 288: "The original etymological root of baptizo and bapto, and also of the nouns and adjectives kindred with them, appears plainly to be the Greek monosyllable *bap*, the leading and original meaning of which seems to have been dipping, immersing, plunging, soaking, drenching in some liquid; and as clearly associated with this, the idea of dyeing or coloring, since this was done by dipping. The precise difference between bapto and baptizo is, that while they both agree in one common and original meaning, that of immersing or plunging, usage has employed bapto to express the idea of coloring as well as the idea of dipping or plunging, while baptizo is not employed in the additional sense of coloring." This is the language of a most eminent scholar, and as Dr. Rosser says, of the "highest reputation as a critic in the United States."

Now you will notice that Prof. Stuart says baptizo and its derivatives express only the idea of dipping or immersion. Now if we refer to the Greek Testament we will find that this is the word the Apostles invariably used in every instance, and which is expressed in English by the verb *baptize*. Matt. 3-11; Mark 1-8; Luke 3-16; John 1-26; Mark 1-4; John 1-33; I Cor. 1-17. So if these passages had been translated, like all the other words, in the original tongue, and the prepositions connected with them, according to Professor Stewart, they would read thus: "I, indeed, *immerse* you *in* water," (not with water, as we shall show hereafter.) Again: "I indeed have *immersed* you *in* water." "John answered saying unto them all, I indeed immerse you *in* water." "John answered saying, I immerse in water." "John did immerse in the wilderness." "And I knew him not, but he that sent me to immerse in water." "For Christ sent me not to im-

merse, but to preach the gospel." We have taken up these passages as they come in order according to the above references. If King James' translators had not been overruled, while they were translating the New Testament from Greek into English, the common reader would never have seen the words baptize, baptism, and the like, in the English language. If the learned Pedo-Baptist scholar, Prof. Stuart, is to be believed, immersion is precisely and literally the proper translation in all these instances. Had this been done there never would have been any controversy on this subject and the Baptists would not be charged of "imposing upon Christians a practice dangerous to health and offensive to delicacy, and really without Scriptural authority."

Having just called attention to this word in the Greek Testament which King James forbade to be translated, but simply retained, and by a little change in the orthography in *baptizo* the final letter *o* is changed to *e*, so we have *baptize* and the noun *baptisma*; the last letter is dropped altogether, so we have *baptism*. By this ingenious arrangement, great latitude is offered the various sects of religionists to construe the meaning which these words never had, to suit their own peculiar notions. *Bapto*, the word which Dr. Hudson's author, Dr. Dale, defines in forty-seven cases, already alluded to, is employed in the Greek New Testament only three times, and its cognate, *embapto*, three times and in our common version is always translated "*dip*." But these words are never used in connection with baptism as a religious ordinance. *Baptizo*, as I above stated, is invariably used. Now to make this matter plain about King James' translators declining to give us the plain English meaning of this word, and which all the lexicographers in the world of any note, say is dipping or immersion, if they had applied the same rule to the word which is translated *sprinkle*, we would have *rantize* and *rantism* wherever the word sprinkle occurs, just as we

have baptize and baptism, in the place of immerse and immersion, had these words been translated into English. Every man of intelligence knows that from the days of the Apostles, till the reign of King James, immerse was the commonly received meaning. All history testifies that it was ordinarily practiced for *thirteen hundred years*.

Dr. Wall, Dr. Whitby, Prof. Stuart, Bishop Smith, Dr. Campbell, Stackhouse, Knapp, McKnight, and we know not how many other Pedo-Baptists of distinction, make this concession.

We have made it a point to examine many Greek lexicons recently in regard to the signification of baptizo. These authors, with very remarkable unanimity, give the primary and ordinary meaning of the word "immerse," or its equivalent. Its definite import is as clear and pointed as any other in the Greek language. It is as specific as rantizo, which might, with as much propriety, be rendered immerse, as to render baptizo to sprinkle. But we have seen no lexicon that rendered the word baptizo, to sprinkle. It has never been translated in the New Testament, but merely adopted into our language. The termination of it was simply changed, and baptizo became baptize. To ascertain the true meaning of it, like any other word, we must refer to the various Greek lexicons. And here it is proper to say of the Greek lexicons to which we refer, that they were made by men who had no partiality for Baptists. We first refer to Liddell and Scott's Greek and English lexicon. This is the standard work and used in nearly all the high schools and colleges of the world, and with which we are sure Dr. Hudson is familiar. "It has been said that there is scarcely a sentence of importance in the whole range of Greek literature that it has not weighed." These learned authors (Episcopalians) as honest scholars, give the following as the only meaning of the word baptizo: 1. "To dip repeatedly: of ships, to sink them. Middle voice, to bathe. 2. To draw water. 3. To baptize."—New Testament.

This great work emanated originally from Oxford, England, which does not show that this controverted word meant either to pour or sprinkle. And yet we turn to a copy of the same lexicon before us, published in unabridged form by Prof. Henry Drisler, of the United States, in the year 1852, in which he gives "*to pour upon*" as the seventh definition of this word baptizo. This he has done without authority, so anxious is he to sustain the cause of Pedo-Baptists. He has thus laid himself liable to the charge of literary forgery; for he represents Liddell and Scott as saying what they have not said. "He deserves," says Dr. Pendleton, "the contempt of the literary world, and the indignant hissings of all the truth-loving portion of mankind." It is said that when Mr. Drisler's first edition appeared he was so severely criticised by the newspapers for taking this unpardonable liberty with these popular and truthful authors, that he promised to expunge his definition "to pour upon" in his next edition. This it seems he never did. So we still have in our American editions this unwarrantable meaning of the word.

But here is what Dr. Charles Anthon says—he is the author of so many Greek and Latin books familiar to the eye of the school boy, and he is also an Episcopalian and Professor of Greek in Columbia College, New York—this is what he says in his letter to Dr. Palmley: "The primary meaning of *baptizo* is *to dip* or immerse, and its secondary meanings, if it ever had any, *all refer*, in some way or other, to the same leading idea, *immersion*. SPRINKLING OR POURING ARE ENTIRELY OUT OF THE QUESTION." Yet Dr. Hudson asserts that this word "*does not uniformly mean to immerse.*" "And therefore (he says) the immersional theory completely breaks down."—See Methodist Armor, page 92. Liddell and Scott and Anthon, the most learned and popular classical scholars of the age, who have had the highest positions in the most noted institutions of the world, declare that to dip or immerse is not only the usual

meaning, but the only definition that can be properly given to baptizo. But Dr. Hudson, a *Presiding Elder* in the Methodist Conference of North Carolina, will hardly be able to compete in scholarship with these celebrated Pedo-Baptist lexicograpers, and according to their view "the immersional theory" does not "completely break down."

We have other Greek lexicons before us. Here is Groves', comprising all the words in the writings of the most popular Greek authors and the Septuagint, and the New Testament. Baptizo, he defines "to dip," "to immerse," "to plunge," "to immerge," &c. No intimation of sprinkling or pouring. Donnegan, also, says the same.

We have Dr. N. L. Rice's debate with Alexander Campbell. Dr. R gives us the result of his researches among Greek dictionaries. He quotes from twelve. Every one says that baptizo means dip, or immerse, nor do any of the twelve assign to this word any meaning that does not admit of immersion. And Dr. Rice is a Presbyterian. He mentions the names of his twelve authors: Scapula, Hedericas, Stephames, Schleusner, Parkhurst, Robinson, Groves, Greenfield and so on. We could here extend the list of these Greek dictionaries to at least forty more, all of which unite in giving baptizo the meaning to dip, to immerse, to plunge, whilst none of them say it means to *pour* or *sprinkle*. We will mention some of them: Jones, Rost, Pasor, Pickring, Passow, Leigh, Richardson, Castell, Guido, Wilson, Robertson, Paschal, Butterworth, Ashe and many others, made in different ages, in different countries, by the learned of different denominations, and still agreeing in giving baptizo (the word always used in the New Testament to express the idea of baptism) the meaning of to immerse, or to plunge, and none of them indicating remotely that it ever means to pour or sprinkle. Does this look like "the immersional theory completely breaks down?" Again, we repeat that there is among all these Greek dictionaries a most perfect unanimity in assigning immerse, or its equiv-

alent, as the ordinary meaning of baptizo. This, alone, instead of "breaking down," ought forever to settle the baptismal controversy.

Blackstone, the idol of the legal profession, is before us. Here is the rule he lays down: "Words are generally to be understood in their *usual* and most *known signification;* not so much regarding the propriety of grammer as their *general and popular use.*"

Now doesn't everybody see that the "most known signification," and the "general and popular use" of baptize was to immerse. Wherever the ordinance of baptism is spoken of in the New Testament, this word baptizo invariably occurs, as we have heretofore shown, and that it cannot in any sense be rendered either to pour or sprinkle, but always and in every case carries with it the idea of immersion. It has also been shown from the most noted Pedo-Baptist writers of the world, that immersion was the only mode practiced for about three hundred years after Christ, and generally, for thirteen hundred years, and yet with all this array of testimony staring him in the face, Dr. Hudson boldly declares that it is "dangerous to health, offensive to delicacy and without Scriptural authority!" And his brother, the editor of the Richmond *Christian Advocate*, says "it ought never to be practiced on females, or if it should, it ought to be by MOONLIGHT by a BLINDFOLDED minister and only in the presence of females!" And yet they say as a mode, it is equally as valid as pouring and sprinkling in the Methodist Church! There must be something the matter with men who talk and write books so utterly contrary to truth.

But to return. We will here give a few more quotations from Dr. Hudson, to show the reader how he gets at the meaning of *baptizo.* It is a curiosity, it is laughable, it is ridiculous. Here they are, page 92, "Methodist Armor:" 1. "Of a FROG pierced and slain," Homer says, "He fell without even looking upward, and the lake (ebap-

teto) was tinged with blood." He then adds: "Anybody knows that the lake could not possibly be immersed in the blood of a FROG, but that the blood of the FROG tinged the water with a red color." "One who argues in this manner never fails, with persons of knowledge, to betray the cause he would defend. A candid mind will disdain to take the help of falsehood, even in support of the truth."

Now we will give this "*frog*" a passing notice, more for Dr. Hudson's information than to honor so frivolous an allusion with an argument. We have the works of Homer before us. Here is a little poem called "The Battle of the Frogs and Mice," and is attributed to Homer, though it is thought by critics to be a spurious production. However, here it is: "*Ebapteto d'aimati l'men horphureo.*" Our friend's translation of the passage is: "The frog fell," (after being pierced and slain by the mice) "without even looking upward, and the lake was tinged with blood." Dr. H. thinks he has found here, if nowhere else, one instance where baptizo cannot mean immerse. After searching through the whole range of classical literature, after he finds all the lexicons against him, and the writers of the Old and New Testament, he has at last succeeded in finding in this "Battle of the Frogs and Mice"—attributed to Homer, who lived, if he lived at all, hundreds of years before Christ—a case where baptizo does not mean to immerse; neither does he claim it to mean to pour or sprinkle. But my friend knows that this word as well as others may be used in a metaphorical or figurative sense, without invalidating or changing its primary signification. The lake was said to be "tinged" with blood, that is to say that part of the water in the lake, was so colored with blood that it had the appearance of being wholly imbued or immersed in blood. This is clearly the intentional use of the word here; it is to be understood *allusively* and not *really; relatively* rather than *absolutely*. If a body had been baptized or immersed it could not have been more wet than

Nebuchadnezzar's was, so if the lake had been dipped in blood it could not have put on a more bloody appearance, caused by the blood of the slain frogs after the battle. Such expressions are allowed poets to give a high coloring to their ideas. It was very common in the late war to hear such hyperbolical expressions as, the fields of battle *ran with blood*, and the whole country *covered* with the slain.

We speak of a person's being immersed in debt, plunged in afflictions: such expressions are called figures of speech. The word dip is often used in the same manner. We speak of the "dip of the magnetic needle;" and in some places there is a practice which ladies call "dipping snuff." Milton says: "A cold, shuddering dew dips me all over." An object might be wet or moistened by being dipped, so also the same can be done by being sprinkled, and yet who would be so simple as to suppose or conclude therefore that dip and sprinkle were synonymous, meant the same thing. And Dr. Hudson himself says, speaking of receiving members in the church: "Methodism sweeps them in by hundreds and thousands; it sweeps in thousands at a haul." Here the words sweep and haul, used to represent the reception of members in the Methodist Church, must be highly figurative, otherwise they would be absurd and nonsensical, as the word "sweep" ordinarily implies a broom, and "haul" the idea of pulling or dragging. So, we see, it will not do to deny the ordinary meaning of words, because speakers and writers sometimes use them in a metaphorical sense. We must stick to the rule laid down by Blackstone, viz: "Words are generally to be understood in their usual and most known signification." (Vol. I, page 59, Chitty's Blackstone.)

Again: 2nd. Dr. Hudson proceeds thus: "Hippocrates, a Greek scholar, says of dyeing substances: 'When it drops upon garments they are (bapteti) dyed or stained.' 'Here we see,' says he, 'immersion is out of the question.'"

3rd. "Aristophanes, speaking of an old comic writer,

says: 'Smearing himself (baptomenos) with frog-colored paint.' Here the term cannot mean dip or plunge."

4. "Aristotle speaking of a coloring substance: "Being pressed, it moistens (baptei) and dyes the hands.' No immersion here."

5. "Plutarch says: 'Thou mayest be bathed (baptizee) but it is not permitted thee to go under the water.'"

6. "Clemens Alexandrinus says of a penitent: 'He was baptized a second time with tears.' He adds: 'Could a man be immersed literally in his own tears? An utter impossibility.'" So we would ask—can Methodist preachers "sweep thousands of people at a haul," literally into the Methodist Church? It would be as "utterly impossible" to take a broom and "sweep thousands" of people at a "haul" into the Methodist Church, as for a man to drown himself in his own tears, "literally."

Dr. H. then goes on to say: "We see now without quoting more instances, that bapto and baptizo do not always and uniformly mean to dip, plunge, or immerse and therefore the immersional theory completely breaks down."

"Though old divines could tame the Greek
And learned what it designed to speak,
Yet Hudson finds it srangely wild,
Chasing it hard through flood and field,
And strives with all his might and main
To overtake it, but all in vain.
O Luther, Calvin, Poole and Wall,
And lexicographers one and all,
What pity, ere you drew the quill,
These doctors of superior skill
Were not at hand to show you how
Baptizo may be rendered now!"

Now if the reader will turn to chapter IV, page 91, of the "Methodist Armor," he will see that we have quoted Dr. H. in full on his efforts to prove that bapto and baptidzo, in the original language, cannot be relied on to support the "immersional theory." He gives us first, one Dr. Dales' forty-seven definitions of bapto, to which we have

heretofore paid attention, and, as we think, have shown no damage done to the "theory" there. He next tells us about Homer's wounded "Frog," about some one's smearing himself with "Frog-colored paint," how garments are dyed, and, lastly, of a "*penitent baptized in tears*," and then comes to the inevitable conclusion, saying, "Therefore the immersional theory completely breaks down." Poor frog! "He fell without even looking upward, and the lake was tinged with blood!" In like manner, as the frog "pierced and slain" went down into the lake, Dr. Hudson sees the immersional theory of the Baptists completely broken down! But enough of this puerile sport. The reader will pardon the writer for his frivolous manner in his criticisms of the language and ideas of a doctor of divinity, and for allowing himself to thus be led off the grave and solemn issue between us.

Let us return to the "Armor." The author calls our attention to "the distinction between sacred and secular meaning of words." "That words change their meaning in the course of time." That "in the Greek language the word *Presbyter*, meant simply an old man; but in the Bible the same word means a preacher, old or young. In the old Greek language a *pastor* meant a *keeper of sheep;* in the Bible it signifies a man in charge of a church," &c. "It follows conclusively," says he, "that if baptizo did mean in the Greek classics, to dip, or immerse, it proves nothing unless it can be shown that it means the same thing in the New Testament." He says: "The conclusion of the whole matter to which we come is: 1. There is nothing in the history of John's baptism, nothing in the practice of the Apostles, nothing in the miscellaneous allusions to baptism in the Epistles, nothing in the meaning of the word baptize, to authorize the belief that any particular mode of baptism is essential to the validity of this rite." (Armor, pages 92–93.)

We pause here to notice these points. First, as to the

words "changing their meaning." We don't intend to let him off here so easy as he imagines. For on such principles, and by such reasonings, the natural and primary meaning of any word, in any law, or in any language might be quickly explained away. Were this principle of interpretation universally admitted no law upon earth could maintain its authority. The obligation of laws and obedience to law-givers, would be at an end. Nor could any fact or doctrine contained in the Bible stand its ground against the operation of this principle. By rejecting the natural sense and primary meaning of inspired terms when we find them contrary to our inclination, and by adopting a secondary or allusive inference as often as we find an occasion, it is an easy matter for the most ungodly person to form a creed of his own, let the real meaning of prophets and Apostles be what they may. Grant but the liberty of taking the principal words of a law, a narrative, or of a doctrine, in a secondary and remote sense and a person of genius might safely evade any law, subvert any doctrine and misrepresent any fact contained in the Bible. While the writer's knowledge of language, ancient or modern, is very limited, still he ventures the assertion that there are few terms in any language but what are as liable to improper and secondary acceptation as the word baptism. Why then, in the name of common sense, should this emphatical term *baptizo*, be singled out as most equivocal of all others in its meaning? Why so much to do to evade its natural force, and yet admit it to be "equally valid?" One thing is certain, the solemn use of water is not denied by our Pedo-Baptist brethren, and if it be omitted baptism itself is wanting. If it be used contrary to divine order and primitive practice the ordinance is corrupted, and so corrupted as not to deserve the original name. Why should this word baptizo of all others express three different actions, immerse, sprinkle, pour? A word that has three senses equally proper and natural to it is indeed a

most accommodating one. It has no determinate sense at all. It is a mere term without an idea and deserves to be banished from the language to which it belongs.

But Dr. Hudson says immersion is valid baptism, equally valid with sprinkling and pouring, and then, alas! he represents the folly of this admission and sets about to get it out of his way by spending all his ingenuity to prove that it is not of divine authority, and that it is both "dangerous and indecent." Equally valid! Strange word! Its meaning occasions no dispute in ancient or modern writings where the sacred institution is not referred to. In all others it is clear, it is plain. No three or four different senses are required for it to perform. It is used to express how people in all ages and in all countries, however cold, plunge their bodies for health and amusement. Even in our own country it allows persons of both sexes for medical purposes and pleasure to practice it without censure. But just as soon as the term is considered as a part of Christian worship, all is darkness and confusion; dangerous and indecent, if immersion is mentioned. All the lexicons, all the dictionaries, all history, become at once the objects of inquiry in order to trump up some other meaning to this troublesome word, but all in vain. It is there, and there it will remain as long as Christ has a people on earth to follow his example in the baptismal waters. It will stand as it has done the storms of persecution, ridicule and contempt, whatever becomes of pouring and sprinkling. The word is as uncompromising in its significance, as any other in the language, when used in secular matters, and it is never called upon to yield its usual vocation, until the holy ordinance is wanted. Then our opponents would have it become a "Proteus or a chameleon," for it must assume different appearances to suit the demand; change its shape or color as may be required. If you desire sprinkling, it is your devoted servant; and you may sprinkle head or face, the hands or feet, for it makes no objection so

water be "applied" to the subject. Have you a preference for pouring? Still it is at your service: for whether you pour much or little on the face or neck, on the fingers or toes, it will sanction your deed. Are you for washing? Why that is all right—you may dip a towel in the basin, instead of your fingers, and apply it to the face or to the hands, or to any part of the body you please, for it will be quite satisfied so you but apply the water in some form or other, and you are at your option. If you happen to be "fond" of water, and to prefer immersion, this good-natured word can't refuse; for it is equally valid, altho' it assumes in this last, a form both "dangerous and indecent." (See Methodist Armor, pages 81-93.) So our Methodist friends are satisfied so water is applied, little or much, to any part of the body, to unconscious babes, penitent sinners and believing saints.

"If water only be applied,
That will suffice, can't be deny'd.
Each one may choose his manner now;
If each is pleased, no matter how.
No matter how? Then why is't there?
And why the crown or face prefer?
Why should the region of the nose
Be deemed more fit than of the toes?
Why should you not baptize the hands,
To execute divine commands?
The feet, to run the Christian road?
The shoulders, to sustain the load?
The neck, the Christian yoke to bear,
And serve the Lord with holy fear?
Why not the sacred rite impart
About the region of the heart?
What, in the nature of the case,
Should make you, Doctor, choose the face?

CHAPTER IV.

We affirm, that the classical usage of baptizo establishes the position of Baptists.

If we have not satisfied the reader that Dr. Hudson's theory on this point has been met, let us look at it again. He quotes from some of the old Greek writers, Hippocrates, Aristotle and others. The first lived about 430 years before Christ and Aristotle died 332 years before the Christian era. Plutarch died about 140 years after Christ. By referring to Prof. Stuart, (that learned author so often alluded to) on the "mode of baptism," (pages 14–20) the reader will see that he has gone through the whole range of classical and sacred literature, reciting numerous examples including those mentioned by Dr. H., and although seven hundred years intervened between the birth of Pindar and the death of Plutarch, yet he shows us by innumerable quotations from these ancient authors, that baptizo was used by them to express immersion or its equivalent, and never, in one single instance, the idea of either *sprinkling* or *pouring*. Most of these Greek writers lived before baptism was instituted, and knew nothing of immersion as a religious ordinance. There was no controversy as to the meaning of baptizo, during the classic period of Grecian history, and the most obvious meaning then given to it was that of immersion. No man who has any reputation to lose, as a Greek scholar, will deny that, up to the time of the introduction of the New Testament, this word meant to immerse, and that usage had fully established this meaning. And Prof. Stuart concludes, after going over the whole ground and considering all its meanings, "that there

is no proof in it all that the word is ever used in any other than one of the two following senses:"

1st. "To dip, plunge, immerse anything in liquid."

2nd. "To overwhelm, literally or figuratively." (See Biblical Repos., April 1833, page 288–179.)

The only possible exception to the above, made by Prof. Stuart, is the case of Dionysius, commenting upon Homer, II, XII, 333, where it is said of Ajax, that he struck Cleobulous across the neck with his heavy sword, "*and the whole sword became warmed with blood.*" Baptisthentos is the word used in Greek, and Prof. S. allows that "*the sword was so dipped or immersed in blood as to become heated.*" The above is the language of Moses Stuart, professor of Andover University, and not a Baptist; and if Dr. Rosser, of the Methodist Church is to be believed, Dr. Hudson's theory of the "secular and sacred meaning of this word," is at an end forever; for says Dr. Rosser: "The judgment of Prof. Stuart, as a Biblical critic, is of the highest reputation in the United States."

When the Savior made his appearance among men, he found this word in common use; so did the Apostles, and consequently used it, as they found it like all other words in the language. Surely, neither the Savior nor his Disciples, would attempt to change the meaning of words from their ordinary use when they wished to impress the minds of their hearers with truths so important. In his positive command, *to teach and to baptize*, there was no uncertainty what was meant. Our Methodist friends have just as much reason to attach some other meaning to the word "teach" as they have to construe the word baptize to mean anything but to dip or immerse. They have just as much cause to say that "teach," in the 28th chapter of Matthew, 19th verse, means to punish, as to say that the word baptizing in the same verse means *sprinkling* or *pouring*. Why? Because the word "teach" (*matheten-sati*) in the Greek Testament, means literally, to disciple;

and if you will consult your English dictionary, you will find the secondary meaning of the verb, *to disciple*, means to *punish*. Now let us be fair; if we change the meaning of one, let the other be treated likewise. Then the verse will read: "Go ye therefore, and PUNISH all nations, *sprinkling or pouring them* in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost."

This example illustrates the folly of avoiding the ordinary meaning of words to carry a point, and it seems to me sufficient to carry conviction to the most biased mind as to the Scriptural mode of baptism.

"For," says a fine writer, "the whole certainty of language rests upon this principle of construing words by their natural and usual meaning. All our assurance from Scripture, even of eternal happiness for the righteous, rests upon it, as well as the eternal punishment of the wicked. When, for instance, in arguing with a Universalist, we set before him the terms 'eternal' and 'everlasting,' he will of course plead that these terms do not fully and fairly mean without any end, and would cite us to the 15th verse of the 45th chapter of Ecclesiastes, in which place the word 'everlasting' in one sense is at an end. And have we to go through the whole range of Greek literature, and give up the eternity of the blessedness of heaven, if there shall be one or two cases found, in which, figuratively or literally, the word may possibly have reference to a less duration? Surely it is sufficient if we establish a prevailing usage. We are then entitled to claim that as the sense of the promise or the threatening of Scripture, unless a different meaning can be proved in this case. The burden of showing an exception is thrown on the side of the objector."

We think this position is so impregnable and so plainly taught in the Scriptures, that Dr. H. has but one alternative left him here, and that is to fall back on his Church Discipline and give up the New Testament argument. On page 43 of the "Armor," he quotes from the XXII Article of the

Discipline, which reads thus: "Every particular Church may ordain, change or abolish rites and ceremonies," &c., and Dr. H. then explains: "It teaches that whenever a ceremony becomes a hindrance to the real progress of the Church, it is to be laid aside. When new ones are needed, they are to be used. The law of expediency is to reign as to these matters." Here, and here alone, Dr. Hudson can rest his case. Here is sufficient authority for human institutions, and for all his theories, which he has failed to find in the Scriptures. But the blessed Savior speaks to all who assume the authority to "ordain, change or abolish rites and ceremonies" belonging to His Church, or fix any "law of expediency" "to reign" therein, thus: "But in vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." Matt. XV-9. "It is a dangerous thing in the service of God, to decline from His own institutions; we have to do with a God who is wise to prescribe His own worship, just to *require* what he has prescribed, and powerful to *revenge* what He has not prescribed."—Bishop Hall.

CHAPTER V.

Argument taken from the Old Testament.

Now, if the reader is not fully satisfied, we ask him to go with us a little further while we turn back to the pages of the Old Testament. Here the word baptize or baptism is nowhere found expressed in the English language. Why is this? It is not because the original word *baptizo* in the Septuagint is not there, for we find it in the Greek version of the Bible, just as it is in the New Testament. But in every instance it has been translated into plain English, and not transferred and retained as it is in the New Testament.

This is a very significant fact. In the Old Testament wherever the word is used, it has no reference to the ordinance of baptism, for it was not then instituted. There was nothing in the way, and the seventy learned men, appointed by King James, have given us the English meaning of baptizo, just as they did all other words. Hence baptize or baptism does not occur at all in the Bible, but its plain meaning in English. The word, however, occurs only fifteen times, says Dr. Barnes. The Old Testament was first written in Hebrew, and then from Hebrew translated into Greek, by the Alexandrine Sanhedrim, over two hundred years before Christ, which is called the Septuagint version. It was this version the Savior and his Apostles read, it being at that time found and used in all the Jewish Synagogues.

Dr. Barnes, says: "The true way to ascertain the meaning of this word baptizo among the Jews, is to examine carefully the fifteen places where it occurs in the Old

Testament." He says: "In Hebrew, the word is *tabal*, and always rendered in Greek baptizo." He then gives us the fifteen places as follows.

1. Leviticus 4-6: "And the priest shall dip his finger in blood."

II. Leviticus 24-6: "Shall dip them in the blood of the bird that was killed over running water."

III. "And dip them in the blood of the slain bird and in the running water."

IV. Numbers 19-18: "And a clean person shall take hyssop and dip it into the running water."

V. Ruth 2-14: "And Boaz said unto her at meal time, Come thou hither and eat of the bread and dip thy morsel in the vinegar."

VI. Exodus 12-22: "And ye shall take a bunch of hyssop and dip it in the blood."

VII. Deut. 33-24: "And let him dip his foot in oil."

VIII. Ezek. 23-15: "Exceeding in dyed attire."

IX. Job 9-31: "Yet shalt thou plunge me in the ditch."

X. Levit. 9-9: "And he dipped his finger in the blood."

XI. I Sam'l 14-27: "And he put forth the end of his rod, and dipped it in the honey comb."

XII. II Kings 8-16: "And he took a thick cloth and dipped it in the water," &c.

XIII. Josh. 3-15: "The feet of the priests that bear the ark were dipped in the brim of the water."

XIV. II Kings 5-14: "And he went down and dipped himself seven times in Jordan."

XV. Gen. 37-31: "And they took Joseph's coat and killed a kid and dipped the coat in the blood."

Now nobody has ever questioned the translation in II Kings where it is said Naaman dipped himself in Jordan, and if the same rule had been observed in Matthew, it would have read, they were dipped by John in Jordan, just as it is in Kings. Indeed, had this same word been trans-

lated from Greek into English in the New Testament as it was invariable done in the Old, we never should have had all this controversy about the "mode" of Christ's ordinance. In every instance where the word baptize and baptism now occurs in the English language, if the original word had been translated as it was done in the Old Testament we would have immerse or dip, and immersion or dipping throughout the New Testament. There is such an abundance of proof of this fact, and that too, from Pedo-Baptist writers of all ages and of the most celebrated scholars of the world, both of ancient and modern times, that it no little surprises us, that a Christian man and a Doctor of Divinity, should write and publish a book in which he states in the most positive manner, that it is a practice both "dangerous to health and offensive to delicacy and really without Scriptural authority."

Nay, more; he says on page 93, Sec. 3: "To require immersion in order to admission into the Church is contrary to the teaching of the Bible and is to 'teach for doctrine the commandments of men.' And to exclude pious Christians from the Lord's table because they have not been immersed is narrow-hearted bigotry." He thus "eats" his own words; for, speaking of the Holy Scriptures as we have before seen, he says: "Whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of faith." And yet right in the face of this general rule of the Methodist Discipline and which he endorses, he calls us "narrow-hearted bigots," because we strictly adhere to and carry out in our practice the very same principle!

He farther states on the same page of his book, Art. 4: "Baptism is enjoined upon all nations, and pouring is adapted to all climates, but immersion is not. How could immersion be performed in those countries where for six months in the year, every pond, river and ocean is converted into solid ice?" Then, I would say, how would Dr.

Hudson get along in such a country if he were there? Would he take the little babes in his arms and pour "solid ice" over their tender bodies and call it baptism or would he pour or sprinkle a few pieces on the head of a man or a woman, and think that sufficient? Whatever difficulties he may see in cold climates, the Baptists have none, for they believe what the Holy Ghost says: "Go teach all nations, *immersing* them," &c. Besides, as we have before shown, the Greeks occupy and live in these cold climates, even in "Snowy Thrace;" still immersion *only* is practiced by them as a Christian ordinance, and, just as we Baptists utterly ignore any other mode. And notwithstanding they reside in those cold climates and often have to break the ice to immerse their candidates they largely outnumber Dr. H.'s boasted thousands, including babies, "penitent seekers," and all. It is no uncommon thing in the cold winters of this country for Baptist ministers to plunge their subjects in the chilly waters covered with ice, and that too, without any danger to their health, or offensive to the most delicate sensibilities of any one, except it be to some *vulgar-minded* person.

Article 5 of page 93, he says: "Baptism by sprinkling can be performed on persons who profess religion on a dying bed, but immersion cannot." Now what does the Dr. mean by this? The inference is clear that unless the dying man is baptized, his chances for heaven are gone, although he professes to have his sins pardoned. All his repentance and solemn professions of conversion just before his soul takes its everlasting flight, are vain, unless he can have the preacher to come and sprinkle a few drops of water on his head! The Baptists have no trouble in such cases. They do not believe God would require impossibilities of the dying penitent. Nothing is said about the thief's baptism as he was dying with the Saviour on the cross. "This day thou shalt be with me in paradise," proclaimed his pardon and was enough to fill his soul with joy. Immersion, it is

true, was impossible in his case, but sprinkling or pouring was not, and yet it was not required either by him or for him. This is another argument that the ordinance by sprinkling was not known at that time, and that it was not administered in any such cases at all in any form.

Article 6, on the same page, closes his chapter 8, thus: "Baptism by pouring comports with decency and propriety, but does immersion?"

CHAPTER VI.

Concluding Remarks on the Mode of Baptism.

We think we have established the fact that baptizo means to immerse and nothing else, when translated into English. It is strange indeed that writers who claim to teach the truth, should endeavor to attach three meanings to this word, since the most learned authors of every age have been unable to discover *one solitary* example where it ever means sprinkling or pouring. We know some of them deny this; still when critically put to the test the same truthful conclusion is invariably reached. To say the word means to sprinkle and pour, as well as immerse, gives it three entirely different actions.

The absurdity of this claim is thus exposed by Dr. Richard Fuller. He says: "Suppose the word saw, meant a *saw*, an *axe*, and a *nail*; how would a carpenter know what we mean when we ask for a saw? Would he hand me an axe or a nail? To say that a word has three distinct literal meanings, is to say that it means neither of them. If there were such a word we should have to employ some other word to show which of the three things we intend. *Ride*, for example, means one thing; it means to ride. It cannot mean *ride* and *eat* and *walk*. Baptizo no more means to sprinkle or pour, than it means to fly." "No man," says he, "in his right mind would think of immersing an object, say an apple, and then contend he had sprinkled it."

"This remark," says President Shannon, "is as applicable to the Greek as to the English. Indeed, it is well known that the Greek excels in the expression of different shades of ideas with precision and certainty by the same words."

The Rev. J. M. Pendleton thus fairly states: "Now if the word baptize in the New Testament means sprinkle or pour as Pedo-Baptists insist, and if baptism is an 'application of water,' is it not infinitely remarkable that water is never said to be baptized upon the subject of the ordinance, and that the water is never said to be applied? If baptize means sprinkle or pour, the water is baptized, not the person. We cannot speak of sprinkling a man without an ellipsis or figure of speech. And no one would expect to find a figure of speech in the Apostolic commission. Sprinkling implies the scattering of the particles of the substance sprinkled. A man cannot be poured, because pouring implies a continuous stream of the substance poured. I say again if baptize in the New Testament means sprinkle or pour the water is baptized. But nowhere is water found in the objective case, after the verb baptize, in the active voice, nor is it found in the nominative case to the verb in the passive voice. We never read I baptize water upon you; but I baptize you. It is never said water was baptized upon them; but it is said 'they were baptized, both men and women.' The subjects of the ordinance were baptized, the water was not. And, therefore, baptize in the New Testament, signifies neither pour nor sprinkle. But substitute immerse for it and how plain and beautiful is every baptismal narration! I immerse *you*, not the water. They were immersed, that is the 'men and women.'" Those who do not look upon this statement of the matter as conclusive against sprinkling and pouring, ought to apply themselves at once to the study of the English Grammar, even if they are Doctors of Divinity."

The celebrated Church historian, Neander, in his letter to Judd, says: "As to your question on the orignal rite of baptism, there can be no doubt whatever that in primitive times the ceremony was performed by immersion, to signify a complete immersion into the new principle of life divine, which was imparted by the Messiah. When St.

Paul says that through baptism we are buried with Christ and rise again with Him, he unquestionably alludes to the symbol of dipping into and rising again out of the water. The practice of immersion in the first centuries was beyond all doubt prevalent in the whole Church."

I might here quote other passages from this learned Lutheran, of similar import, but surely this ought to satisfy any honest inquirer after truth.

That popular English divine, Dr. Whitby, says: "Immersion was religiously observed by *all Christians for thirteen centuries*, and approved by our Church, and the change of it into sprinkling, even without any allowance from the author of the institution, being that it was first introduced by the Romanists."

CHAPTER VII.

The Greek Prepositions.

Great importance is attached to the use of the Greek prepositions by Pedo-Baptist writers, to disprove the idea of immersion. They say that these prepositions translated "in," "into," and "out of," prove nothing of themselves; because, they say, they as often mean "unto," "to," "at," "nearly," "with" and "from," and are so translated in various places in the New Testament. If this be so, then there is nothing certain in the use of language. The writer once heard a series of sermons delivered by a popular Methodist minister, whom he highly esteemed, in which he assiduously attempted to prove that these prepositions were improperly translated where they were employed to describe the baptism of the Saviour and the Eunuch; that where it is said they "*came up straightway out of the water*," ought to have been translated, *from* instead of "*out of*," and that Philip and the Eunuch did not go down "into" the water, but "at or near by," &c.

We again beg the reader to observe what that great law commentator, Blackstone, laid down as a rule in the use of language, elsewhere quoted. "Words are generally to be understood in their usual and most known signification; not so much regarding the propriety of grammar as their general and popular use."

We will first consider the preposition *en*. Prof. Mell says: "The primary meaning of *en* is in, and not 'with' or 'at.'" He says that "'en' occurs in the New Testament *two thousand seven hundred and twenty times*."

It is translated 'at' in our common version only seventy-six times. In more than forty of these seventy-six places it occurs before the name of a city, as at Jerusalem, &c., when it might be properly translated 'in.' In about twenty more of the seventy-six places referred to it occurs in such expressions as these: at that day, at that hour, &c., so that it may be affirmed that not ten times in nearly three thousand does the Greek preposition *en* mean simply 'at' in our English version.

Still we are gravely told that *en* is as frequently translated at, to or with, as it is in. It is true our translators have translated "*en udati*" "with water," which certainly ought to have been in water. Let us see how it is in other portions of the Bible. It is said John was baptizing "*en eremo*," in the wilderness, when if *en* is rendered with, it would read, baptizing with the wilderness. So with John when at Jordan: "They were all baptized of John with the river Jordan." Now suppose we try the Pedo-Baptist view, and substitute sprinkling or pouring in these sentences. It would be: "John was sprinkling or pouring with the wilderness," and "they were all poured with the river Jordan!" What stupid nonsense!

Now let us briefly notice that other common preposition *eis*, which literally means into, but which our opponents contend ought to be translated to; that Philip and the Eunuch only went *to* the water and not *into* it. If this be so, then Joseph was not required to "flee into Egypt," and in Matthew, 8th chapter, the devils did not "enter into the swine," and the swine did not "run into the sea," and the keepers of the swine did not "go into the city."

Again, how could the "new wine break the old bottles," without being put into them? It is said in Matthew 25-46, "And these shall go away 'into' everlasting punishment, but the righteous 'into' life eternal." According to their theory they would get the wicked and the righteous *to*, *at*, or *near by* those places. But they readily admit that

it means *into*, unless baptismal waters are referred to. This little word *eis* is a strange word indeed, if what they say of it be true. It will take a man *into* a country, *into* a city, *into* a house, *into* a ship, *into* heaven, *into* hell, *into* any place in the universe except the water. Poor, afflicted word! It seems to be seized with hydrophobia every time it is required to go into the water! So says the Rev. J. M. Pendleton in his "Three Reasons."

Such are some of the absurdities of our Pedo-Baptist friends to evade the force of the English translation of the Scriptures, and of the original Greek. If the reader desires to investigate the use of these controverted terms farther, he may consult Drs. Carson, Curtis, Mell, Pendleton, Pengilly and Booth.

In concluding this part of the discussion, we maintain that no cause can be true which requires its advocates to resort to such wormings and quirkings to support it. No wonder the infidel thanked the Pedo-Baptist minister when he tried to show that the Eunuch went to the water, but not into it. For he said he never could believe that Daniel was cast into the lions' den, or that the Hebrew boys were cast into the fiery furnace, and now he saw there was no miracle about it.

CHAPTER VIII.

When and How Pouring and Sprinkling Originated.

The reader is, by this time, desirous of knowing at what period and on what accounts the custom of pouring and sprinkling was first introduced. We have shown by quotations from the standard histories of the world that immersion was generally practiced by all the Churches for *thirteen hundred years* after Christ.

Mr. Wall, that great English divine and eminent scholar, who has explored all the voluminous writers of antiquity, has discovered that the first case on record of pouring or sprinkling took place about the middle of the third century of the Christian era. The man's name was Novatian, and it occurred on this wise: "Novatian was taken very sick and was like to die, and had not been baptized. He asked and obtained leave of the Pope to be baptized in the bed where he lay (if such a thing could be called baptism) and was *sprinkled over in bed;* or *water poured all over him,* as the word signifies." Mr. Wall then goes on to say: "Novatian recovered of his sickness. There was a vacancy in the See of Rome at that time, (A. D. 251.) A man by the name of Cornelius and this Novatian were rival candidates of the office. Cornelius received a majority, and Novatian claimed also to be chosen. Cornelius writes a long letter to Fabius, the Bishop of Antioch, in which he describes the case of Novatian, and says that he came not lawfully to his order of priesthood, much less was he capable of being chosen Bishop; for, says he, all the clergy and a great many of the laity, were against his be-

ing chosen Presbyter; because it was not lawful for any one that had been *poured over* in his bed, as he had been, (and not baptized) to be admitted to any office of the clergy." (See Wall's Hist., part II, chapter IX, Sec. 2.) Here is the first case of either *sprinkling or pouring*, for baptism, and here we see a serious objection taken against Novatian, on account of his imperfect baptism, or rather no baptism, an objection in which "all the clergy united," and he therefore failed of his being Bishop.

But this was not the only objection to Novatian, even if he had been baptized, (immersed) if it was done while he was sick. For there was an Act of Council affirmed by the 12th Canon which would prevent him from office. It reads thus: "He that is baptized when he is sick ought not to be made a priest, for his coming to the faith is not voluntary, but from necessity." In the second place, as to the mode. While Novatian was living, one Magnus submits this question to Cyprian, viz.: "Whether they are to be esteemed *right Christians*, who are not washed in the water, but only sprinkled?" Cyprian answers, that "the baptism was to be esteemed good, 'necessitati cogente,' necessity compelling to it, and God granting his indulgence." Now this is the first case to be found on record where sprinkling or pouring as an ordinance is mentioned, and what is also worthy of notice, even at that time baptism was not regarded as valid unless it was voluntary on the part of the candidate; infant baptism was not yet known.

Thus began this *substitute* for Christian baptism, and from this period, A. D. 250, onward, sprinkling was permitted, but only in case of necessity and in prospect of death, for it was falsely believed that the ordinance was necessary to salvation. "France," says Mr. Wall, "seems to have been the first country in the world where baptism by affusion was used ordinarily for persons in health." This affusion, or pouring, in the Church of Rome was first *tolerated* in the eighth century, while immersion was still the estab-

lished law of the Church: and so things stood for several hundred years.

Sir David Brewster, the editor of the Edinburg Encyclopedia, says: "The first law for sprinkling was obtained in the following manner: Pope Stephen II being driven from Rome by Astolphus, King of the Lombards, in 753, fled to Pepin, who a short time before had usurped the crown of France. While there, the monks of Cressy, in Brittany, consulted him, whether in case of *necessity*, baptism performed by pouring water on the head of the infant would be lawful. Stephen replied that it would." So we see that it was only in case of necessity that the Pope at this time would allow sprinkling or pouring to be lawful baptism. Immersion was the only mode except in cases of *necessity*, till the Council held at Ravenna, in the year 1311, declared immersion or sprinkling to be indifferent.

In Scotland, sprinkling was never practiced till after the Reformation; and in England, even in the reign of Edward VI, immersion was usually observed. Queen Elizabeth and Edward were both immersed, as the record shows. Royalty did not think, like my friend, that it was either indecent or dangerous to their health to follow the example of Christ.

Dr. Wall and Prof. Stuart, two of the most learned historians of modern times and both Pedo-Baptists, tell us that during the reign of Elizabeth, from A. D., 1558 to 1603, sprinkling was not allowed except in cases of weak children "not strong enough to be brought to the baptismal fonts." "It was about this time," says Dr. Wall, "that many proud ladies and gentlemen first, and then by degrees the common people, would obtain the favor of the Priest to have their children pass for weak children too tender to endure dipping in water."

Now if I have not shown that sprinkling and pouring as an ordinance of baptism first originated amid the corruptions which crept into the Christian Churches, that the

first case which ever occurred in the history of the world was that of Novatian above described, and that for fifteen hundred years after the death of Christ, it was used only in exceptional cases; I say if this has not been fully shown, there is nothing that can be shown. The man who is not convinced by the testimony so fairly given to support this fact "would not be persuaded though one should rise from the dead." "Such a man, if he had a purpose to accomplish by it, would deny that the sun shone in the firmament of heaven during these fifteen centuries."

What, then, is to be thought of a Methodist minister, a Doctor of Divinity, and one who writes and publishes books for the public to read, who boldly declares: "There is no command to baptize by immersion;" that "the weight of evidence is in favor of sprinkling or pouring;" that "immersion is without Scriptural authority, and of really primitive practice?" I say, any man who makes such broad and groundless assertions ought to pause and study at least the alphabetical portions of Church history. I think if he would do this and study to arrive at truth without prejudice, candor and honesty would induce him to publish a new edition of the "Armor," and expunge such unauthorized and offensive statements. It is wonderful indeed how early education and training, combined with prejudice, can hold a good and devoted Christian man in bonds of iron and will not permit him to break the fetters of his bondage and stand out in the broad sunlight of truth.

We have now concluded our task which we assumed in reply to Dr. Hudson's chapters on the Gospel Church and the mode of baptism, and leave it to the reader to judge between us. What we have written, we have written. While we have at times used strong language, we have not intended to offend, and certainly have not written aught with malice.

CHAPTER IX.

We next invite the reader to follow us in the examination of the Doctor's chapter IX, on Infant Baptism, page 94, "Armor." Before we take up his line of argument, we attempt first to prove that the Pope of Rome, "that man of sin," is the author of infant baptism.

For fifteen centuries infant baptism has existed in the corrupt Romish apostacy, and all "the Churches" in Europe, which can trace their origin to Rome have maintained its existence since their origin. It is found in this country as well as in Europe, connected with all those ecclesiastical organizations whether founded by Wesley, Calvin, Luther or Henry the Eighth, and held in importance in proportion as they approximate in form to the Romish Hierarchy. Had there never been a kind of superstitious faith that in baptizing infants the original sin attached to them was in some mysterious way washed away, we should never have heard of such a custom, or of infant church membership. Had the New Testament been the only guide of professing Christians, in regard to the Church, that it is a company of believers, baptized upon a profession of their faith, and associated together to "keep the ordinances once delivered to the saints" by Christ and his Apostles, the world would not have to witness the schisms, the confusion and animosities which rend and distract Christian bodies to the mortification and anguish of the *true and humble* followers of Christ.

There is no mention of it anywhere in the Scriptures, nor did the Apostles or early disciples ever practice it. The Papacy found its origin, and whatever changes or modifications this Mystery of Babylon may undergo to suit the different times and nations, its wicked influence and power can never be utterly destroyed so long as infant baptism, the "main pillar and ground" of it remains. Infant baptism has never been the occasion of any good. Its influence has been evil and only evil continually.

The Baptists and those who have held similar views, under whatever names they have been called, from the earliest introduction of it, have never ceased to resist its propagation and wage an unceasing war with tongue and pen against it, even tho' in ancient times it subjected them to the stake, the gibbet and death in all the cruelties human fiends could invent; and in modern times to imprisonment, the confiscation of their property, and everywhere the objects of hatred, scorn, persecution and contempt of all religious sects combined.

The reader may think these are very strong assertions, but if we fail to prove them it will not be for the want of abundant authority accessible to the searcher after truth.

For more than two hundred years after the Christian era, there is no trace of infant baptism found in any history. We never find any mention of it till the notion prevailed that baptism is essential to salvation. This corruption crept into the churches and increased with Papal power till it became one of the chief instruments in perpetuating its supremacy.

Some time during the third century it is recorded that a certain wealthy lady whose name was Quintilla, wrote a letter to Tertullian, the Bishop of the Church at Carthage, to get his sanction to baptize her infant, and his answer to this letter has been preserved and contains the first allusion to the baptism of children which is recorded in the annals of Church history. He said to her: "Those who ad-

minister baptism know very well that it is not to be rashly given." He went on further to show to her in this same letter, at length, that children should first be instructed, and when they understand Christianity, let them profess it and then be baptized.

Cyprian, the successor of Tertullian in the Church at Carthage, received a letter from a man by the name of Fidus, asking how soon after birth it might be proper to baptize? Cyprian it seems was not able to answer this strange and new question, but called a council of sixty-seven of his brother bishops of North Africa who gave it as their opinion, "that a child might be kissed with the kiss of charity as a brother, so soon as it is born." It was this same Cyprian, who gave it as his opinion that water poured about a person in bed (if he were sick and could not be immersed) would answer in the place of baptism. But history informs us that neither Cyprian nor his sixty-seven bishops could influence mothers to baptize their infants till another solemn council was called by the priests and bishops, about the beginning of the fifth century, more on account of their purses than the souls of the little babes, and passed a decree that "infants ought to be baptized for the remission of sins and that all who denied this doctrine should be accursed." Previous to this, great multitudes of believers, grieved at this and other corruptions creeping into the churches, had withdrawn and formed separate societies of their own, retaining the simplicity of the ordidances as practiced by Christ and his Apostles.

The Catholic bishop, Augustine, represents them as asking, "What good the sacrament of Christ's baptism could do unconscious infants?" They were told that "whoever denies that little children by baptism are freed from perdition and eternally saved, that they be accursed." This was about the year 417. The Pope thus introduced and established infant baptism and baptismal salvation, and issued his fulminating decree against those who oppos-

ed it, with his death penalty affixed. But the stubborn-hearted, (and as Dr. H. calls them), the narrow-hearted Baptists resisted this satanic custom; they refused to baptize their children; they disowned the baptism of the Catholics by refusing to receive them into their churches till they had been baptized by themselves. This the Catholics called re-baptism, or ana-baptism, and thus the name Ana-Baptists, which has been applied to us almost to the present day. The strong arm of the secular power was turned against them. A decree was procured from the Emperor that not only those who re-baptized but those who denied the baptism of infants should be put to death.

Says Gibbon, the historian: "By this law, three hundred bishops (pastors) and several thousand of their members were torn from their churches, stripped of their possessions and banished to the islands." The doctrine of baptismal regeneration, gave rise to infant baptism, purgatory, and all those abominable customs, such as being daubed with priests' spittle, walking from the water with lighted tapers, confirmation by bishops, &c., having their origin and propagation in a wicked superstition and greed for gain, in ancient times, and fragments of it still clinging to large bodies of zealous and useful Christians of modern times.

In the year 1842, a manuscript of Hippolytus, was found in an Armenian convent on Mount Athos, in Turkey. This work has been carefully examined by eminent scholars and there is no doubt of its being genuine. It appears that this man, Hippolytus, was pastor of the Church at Pontus, near the mouth of the Tiber river, in Italy, and that he had been a pupil of Iraeneus, and wrote this work about 225 years after Christ. Speaking of baptism he says: "We in our day never defended the baptism of children, which had only begun to be practiced in some regions, unless it were as an exception and innovation. The baptism of infants we did not know."

Dr. Bunsen, the translator, adds: "The baptism of new born infants was utterly unknown to the early churches, not only down to the end of the second century, but indeed to the middle of the third." And Dr. Bunsen was not a Baptist.

Clemens and Ignatius, who were cotemporary with Paul and John, and whose writings are held in high esteem among scholars, mention nowhere the baptism of children and only of those who were instructed and believed.

CHAPTER X.

Infant Baptism, Page 94, "Armor."

Dr. H. says: 1. "In tracing back the history of the Jewish Church, we find that infants were members of that Church. This right of infant membership was established when that Church was organized." "Every man child among you shall be circumcised." "He that is eight days old shall be circumcised." "He that is uncircumcised shall be cut off."

2. "The door through which children entered into the Old Testament Church was circumcision."

3. "The visible Church of God has always been the same. The Christian Church to-day is the Old Testament Church purged from the apostate Jews. And around this purged Church, the New Testament Church was formed."

4. "The right of infant membership existing in the Church has never been repealed. It stands intact to-day. No change has occurred. No proclamation has been made repealing the law of infant membership. And it is a well known fact that a law once passed remains in force until formally repealed. Now as infants were members of the Jewish Church, and as the Gospel Church is but a continuance of the Jewish, and no repeal having taken place of this law of infant membership, the conclusion is inevitable that the right of infant membership remains intact."

5. "Circumcision with other forms of the Jewish Church gave way to baptism in the Christian Church. Baptism,

like circumcision, is an initiatory right of admission into the visible Church. As circumcision was the gate for the Jew and the Gentile proselyte into the Jewish Church; so baptism is the door into the Christian Church. Once more, baptism, like circumcision, is a sign and seal of God's covenant. The children of believers hold a similar relation to the Christian Church as the Jewish children did to the Jewish Church, the former entering the Church by baptism, the latter by circumcision."

As a proof of the above, Dr. H. quotes Romans 11, 18,-24. This is the same old story held by most Pedo-Baptist authors. Since they cannot find any authority for infant baptism in the New Testament, any practice of it by Christ or his Apostles, they infer it by claiming the Christian Church is a substitute or continuation of what they call the "Jewish Church," which included infants.

The Jewish theocracy and the Christian Church are not identical.

The word *Church* does not occur in the Old Testament; but for the sake of the argument, let us call that organization of the Jews, "The Old Jewish Church," and proceed to show that the Christian Church is in no way identical with it or a "*continuance*" of it.

1st. According to the prophets a new kingdom was to be set up, while the Jewish organization, which had been in existence for centuries, was to pass away. "And in the days of these kings shall the God of Heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed, and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever." Daniel II, 44. The language is clear that this new kingdom refers to the one Christ was to set up, and it was to be a new one—not a "continuance" of the old or even a substitute for it. There is no intimation that the old Jewish kingdom was to be re-organized or continued in any form. John referred to it when he said, "Repent ye: for

the kingdom of Heaven is at hand." Was this the old Jewish Church?

In the beginning of his ministry Jesus proclaimed this new kingdom was at hand. "The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye and believe the gospel." Mark I-15. The prophecy of Daniel is fulfilled. A new dispensation is at hand. Such language had never been heard before: "Repent ye and believe the gospel." A new era has commenced. Christ said: "The law and the prophets were until John: since that time the kingdom of God is preached and every man presseth into it." This does not look like the old Jewish Church and the one Christ set up were the same. If infants were members of the old Church, how could they be members of this new one which required repentance and faith before they could be included in it? There surely can be no argument here for infant baptism, no intimation of it.

Again: John the Baptist told the members of the Jewish Church to repent and bring forth works meet for repentance before he would receive them to baptism. He called them a "generation of vipers." They might be worthy members of the old, but utterly unfit for the Church of Christ. The Saviour told Nicodemus that he must be born again before he could become a fit subject for his Church, and yet he was an officer of high rank in the Jewish Church. He said to the scribes, who were the doctors in the Jewish Church: "Ye shut up the kingdom of heaven against men, for ye neither go in yourselves, neither suffer ye them that are entering to go in."

Now, according to this language of the Saviour, both kingdoms were in existence at the same time. If Christ's kingdom was not in existence it could not be "shut up," and if they were the same the scribes were already in it. But they were not in it, for he tells them, "ye neither go in yourselves neither suffer others," &c. If then they were in the Jewish Church and *not* in the Christian Church, they

certainly could not be the same, or one the "continuance" of the other, notwithstanding Dr. H. declares that "the Christian Church to-day is the Old Testament Church." * * * He says "around this purged Old Testament Church, as a nucleus, the New Testament Church was formed." He quotes John the Baptist and Paul in Romans 11 to prove his assertion. He says: "By the good olive tree, Paul can mean nothing but the Jewish Churches," &c. The Apostle seems to me here to advance a different idea from my friend. He says to the Jews that God has not cast off all Israel, tho' as a nation they rejected Christ and put him to death, yet a remnant should be saved according to the election of grace. He says to the Gentiles: "Boast not against the branches," the natural branches, the Jews. Do not exult over them as if you were naturally better than they and were in no danger.

In Ephesians, II, 11–13, "Wherefore remember, that ye being in time past Gentiles in the flesh, who are called uncircumcision by that which is called circumcision in the flesh made by hands; that at the time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promises, having no hope and without God in the word; but now in Christ Jesus ye who were afar off, are made nigh by the blood of Christ." Paul completely refutes the identity idea of the two Churches at the beginning of the chapter, Romans II. Says he: "For I also am an Israelite, of the seed of Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin." He was therefore a circumcised member of the Jewish Church, and yet he became a member of the Christian Church by repentance, faith and baptism. Why was this, if, as Dr. H. asserts, the two Churches were one and the same? If baptism has taken the place of circumcision, why was Paul commanded to receive baptism, having also been circumcised? Dr. H. says: "Baptism, like circumcision is an initiatory rite of admission into the visible Church. As circumcision was the gate for the Jew

and the Gentile proselyte into the Jewish Church, so baptism is the door into the Christian Church." He says, "Baptism like circumcision, is a sign and seal of God's covenant."

II. The Two Covenants Examined.

There are two, the covenant of circumcision and the covenant of grace.

Our Pedo-Baptist friends insist that there was but one covenant—they will not say covenants—while Paul speaks of "covenants," "covenants of promise," the "two covenants," &c. How they can make the covenant of circumcision and the covenant of grace one and the same defies comprehension. The gospel covenant, or covenant of grace, was not made with Abraham, it was confirmed to Abraham. It was made before; it must have been in existence or it could not have been confirmed, for the confirmation of anything implies its previous existence. Paul says: "The covenant that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul that it should make the promise of none effect." The covenant with respect to the Messiah was confirmed to Abraham when he was seventy-five years old, (Genesis 12,) and the covenant of circumcision was made with him when he was ninety-nine years old. (Genesis 17.) So there were twenty-four years intervening between the two transactions. Now if the gospel covenant was made with Abraham, and if circumcision was the seal of that covenant, then it had no seal for twenty-four years after it was made. And if this covenant of grace was made with Abraham by what provisions were those saved who lived before Abraham, Abel, Enoch and others?

Dr. H. can here see how absurd is his theory that the gospel covenant and Jewish circumcision are the same and from it argue that infant baptism is taught in the Scriptures. Neither circumcision nor baptism is anywhere refer-

red to by the sacred writers as a "seal" of a covenant. Circumcision is called a "token of the covenant" God made with Abraham, and a "seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had, yet being uncircumcised." It was never a seal of the righteousness of any other man.

Again, the seal of circumcision was applied to but one sex and if baptism comes in the room of circumcision, why are females included? The whole Jewish Church was composed entirely of males. If therefore you could prove everything else, you would still have no warrant for the baptism of female infants, according to the argument of circumcision. The painful ordinance of circumcision was administered to infants, not for moral but for physical reasons, and only to males. "Circumcision was a seal to none but Abraham," says Dr. Mell. There is only one place in the Bible where circumcision is called a seal, and then it is said to be a seal, not of the faith of Abraham but of the righteousness of the faith which he had. See Rom. IV-2: "And he received the sign of circumcision; a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had, yet being uncircumcised." This does not say as our opponents quote it, that circumcision was a sign and seal of Abraham's faith, but a seal of the righteousness of that faith.

Circumcision was a seal only to Abraham, and not of his faith but of the righteousness of his faith. Baptism is nowhere in the Scriptures said to be a seal of anything to its subjects. The only "seal" which we find in the New Testament is in reference to the Holy Spirit, "whereby he is sealed to the day of redemption." Eph. IV-30. When sinners believe in Christ, they are sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise which is the "earnest of their inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession." Eph. I-13. "And this is not applicable to unconcious babes but to the intelligent believer in Christ." In fact, this whole subject of the Abrahamic covenant is so involved in the mysteries of God's eternal purposes, it is wonderfully

strange that our Pedo-Baptist friends seek to find in it any intelligent support for infant baptism. Can it be possible that God has so concealed the evidences of one of His positive commands, as to require us to resort to the deep and hidden mysteries of the Old Testament to find what is our duty? The gospel and its ordinances were never designed for infants, but only for those old enough to understand it and believe it. The new or gospel covenant is thus expressed: "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and the house of Judah. I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. And they shall teach no more every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord, for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord." (Jer. XXX-31-33-34. See also Heb. VIII-10-11.) God's law is to be written in the mind and heart of all included in this new covenant. Does not this effectually exclude infants, as they are all to know him, from the *least* unto the greatest? If you make the Abrahamic covenant and the gospel covenant the same, it is an argument against the baptism of infants. There is a covenant by which infants are saved, but it is not the Abrahamic or gospel covenant; it is the covenant of the Father with His Son in which he engaged to die to redeem them.

That distinguished Pedo-Baptist divine, Prof. Stuart, after going over the whole ground, concludes by saying: "The Abrahamic covenant furnishes no ground for infant baptism." Again: If the Jewish nation was a Church of God it could not be the same as the Christian Church, or sustain any relation to it. The Saviour said to his disciples that "He had chosen them out of the world, therefore the world hateth you."—John 15-19. And yet these disciples were members in good standing in the so-called Jewish Church; they had all been circumcised. But this availed them nothing. The religion of the Jews and the wicked-

ness of the Gentiles stood on the same level. They all were required to repent, believe and be baptized before they were admitted into the Christian Church. Paul makes this matter plain in regard to the religion of the Jews and the Church of God: "For ye have heard of my conversation in time past in the Jews' religion, how that beyond measure I persecuted the Church of God, and wasted it."—Gal. 1-13. It is true that God had given to the Jew the revelation of his will and thus he had the advantage. "What advantage then hath the Jew, or what profit is there in circumcision? Much every way: chiefly because that unto them were committed the oracles of God."—Romans 3-1. But when the Jews rejected Christ these privileges were withdrawn from them and conferred upon the Gentiles.

Dr. Barnes, that great Presbyterian divine, says: "The Gentiles had been like the wild olive, unfruitful in holiness; that they had been uncultivated by the institutions of true religion, and consequently had grown up in the wildness of sin and nature, while the Jews had been like a cultivated olive, long under the training and blessing of God." But if we were to grant that the Christian Church was a continuance of the old Jewish organization, this would not prove infant baptism, for infants were *born* in the "Jewish Church" and not *admitted* into it by circumcision as is alleged. Circumcision kept them in the Jewish nation; it was not, as our opponents say, an "initiatory rite" at all. "And the uncircumcised man-child, whose flesh of his foreskin is not circumcised, that soul *shall be cut off* from his people." (Gen. XVII, 14.) But what will they do with the female children? Since they were not circumcised, and baptism comes in the room of circumcision and the one is the "continuance" of the other, they must find some other reason for baptizing the female babes. But the Bible nowhere intimates that baptism takes the place of circumcision.

How such an idea ever got into the minds of our breth-

ren is beyond the reach of imagination. If it had been the case, why did the Church of Antioch, send Paul and Barnabas up to Jerusalem to obtain information in regard to the doctrine that "except they be circumcised, after the manner of Moses they could not be saved," which certain men taught that came down from Judea? (Acts. XV.) How easily could this trouble have been settled by teaching them that baptism had taken the place of circumcision and silenced their dissensions. But no such thing had ever entered their minds. It would have been so natural for them to have spoken of this substitute in their dispute with the Judaizing party, if at that time there had been any practice of it among the churches. Yet not the most distant allusion is even made, that baptism was now substituted for circumcision.

To keep their nationality Paul made no objection to the Jews circumcising their children; but when they wished to connect it in any manner with the idea of salvation, he expressly told them that "circumcision profiteth nothing." It is clear, beyond the shadow of a doubt, that if baptism became a substitute for circumcision it would have been so stated in the discussion in the Council held at Jerusalem where the Apostle and Elders met to settle the dispute about keeping up the practice of circumcision among the churches. Had there been a Pedo-Baptist brother there he would have told them how baptism had been adopted as a substitute and thus endeavored to silence their cavils. But Paul and Barnabas and Peter and John decided the matter in a different way, and left it to the invention of wicked men who imposed it upon their superstitious followers long after Christ and his Apostles had gone home to the Father.

If we take a mere inference as authority for one of the ordinances of the Church we run into inextricable mazes without hope of rescue. If the "Church of England" should infer the union of Church and State from the Jewish theocracy; if the Pope of Rome should, on the same ground,

maintain that one man should be at the head of "the Church" like the Jewish High Priest; that the sacrifice of the mass is Scriptural, because the priests in the "Jewish Church" offered sacrifices for the sins of the people; that the Pope is infallible, because the High Priest could deliver oracles by consulting Urim; that there are seven sacraments, because the number seven forms a conspicuous figure in the Hebrew ritual; that women may baptize their infants, because a Jewish mother circumcised her child, I say, if all such inferences are advocated, what answer could our opponents return? For the baptism of infants rests on the same foudation and is supported by the same arguments.

CHAPTER XI.

"Christ's Recognition of Infant Baptism." Page 96
"Armor."

"Proofs." "There were brought unto him little children that he should put his hands on them and pray, and the disciples rebuked them. But Jesus said, Suffer little children and forbid them not to come to me, for of such is the kingdom of heaven. And he laid his hands on them and departed thence." Matt. XIX-13-15. "And they brought unto him also infants that he would touch them: but when his disciples saw it they rebuked them. But Jesus called them unto him and said, Suffer little children to come unto me and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of God. Verily I say unto you, whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, shall in no wise enter therein." Luke XVIII-15-17.

Dr. Hudson then proceeds to comment as follows: "Suffer little children to come unto me * * * * for of such is the kingdom of God."

He says: "What is the meaning of the kingdom of God?" "The kingdom is sometimes used to signify the visible Church on earth." "The kingdom of heaven is like a net that was cast into the sea and gathered of every kind."—Matt. 13–47. "Then again," he says, "it is used to mean the Church of God in a state of glory. 'Now this I say brethren, flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom

of God.' If we take the first meaning then the passage would read: 'For of such is the visible Church, or such belonged to the Church on earth.' The Church was then the Old Testament Church. The day of Pentecost had not come; the Christian Church come of the Old into the New. These children being the children of Jewish parents had been introduced into that Church by circumcision. They were then members of that Jewish Church." "Hence," he says, "such are members of the Church, of the kingdom of God." "Or," says he, "let us take the other meaning that the kingdom of God means the heavenly state. Then it teaches that all children are born into a salvable state. The atonement of Christ puts them in a state of salvation. The Bible authorizes us to baptize all persons who are fit subjects, be they infants or adults. If a grown person be a fit subject, or if a child be a fit subject, baptize him. And for this reason it is not necessary to have an express command to baptize infants. There is no command to baptize persons ten, twenty, fifty or one year old. The command is to baptize *all who are fit subjects* of the kingdom, young or old." He then concludes this part of his argument in the following language: "We are shut up to one of two conclusions: either infants are not fit to go to heaven, or admit their fitness for baptism. For if you admit their fitness for heaven that implies that they have saving grace, and saving grace is universally conceded to be the ground of baptism. We must believe then either the horrid doctrine of infant damnation, or the doctrine of infant baptism."

Now let us briefly review this stronghold of Methodism in support of infant baptism. The passages of Scripture above quoted by Dr. H. and so much relied on by our opponents in proof of their teaching, say not one word about infant baptism or infant Church membership. Those who brought little children, desired that Christ should touch them; and he took them up in his arms, put his hands on

them and blessed them. Ah! how much would Dr. H. and his friends give, if the Scripture had said, *and He baptized them*, instead of saying, "He blessed them." But it is distinctly declared that "Jesus did not baptize at all, but his Disciples." And if the baptism of the children was here intended why did the Apostles rebuke them who brought them to the Saviour? If it had been customary for little children to be brought by their parents to have them baptized, does it not seem strange that the Apostles would here rise up and rebuke them in the presence of their master?

But, you ask, for what purpose then were these children taken to Christ? The text shows us. "Then were brought unto him little children that he should *put his hands on them and pray*." Who has the right to infer that these children were baptized? Or that baptism was even mentioned? But Dr. H. says, "such are the members of the Church." Now Christ said no such thing. He said, "of such is the kingdom of heaven."

Dr. Barnes puts it right in his notes on this passage. Says he: "Of such as these, that is, of persons of such tempers as these, is the Church to be composed. He does not say of those infants, but of such persons as resemble them, or were like them in temper, was the kingdom of heaven made up: it is proper then that He should pray for them." Dr. Barnes is high Presbyterian authority.

But let our Savior tell us what he meant. In Matt. 18-3, "Except ye be converted and become as *little children*, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of God." Here is the resemblance between little children and converted persons, who alone are fit subjects for Church membership, but not one word about infant baptism. The beautiful lesson taught in the above passage is destroyed by straining it to teach infant baptism. The idea that Christ wished to impress on parents was, that their children should be objects of deep solicitude and prayer; that they should be brought to him by faith for his blessing, but not for bap-

tism, for that he has forbidden, by commanding those who are to be baptized, first to believe. It does not matter whether the kingdom of heaven means the Church visible or invisible. Christ does not say, as Dr. H., that children are members of it, but that its members are *like* children. He does not say His Church is composed of children, but of such as are *like* children.

Kitto, that great scholar and author, and a Pedo-Baptist says: "In reference to infant baptism which it is so common to seek for in these passages, there is clearly not the slightest trace to be found."

Bishop Taylor, another eminent Pedo-Baptist says: "To rely on this text as proof of infant baptism, proves nothing so much as the *want of a better argument*."

But, Doctor, we are not done with you here yet. You say that "baptism is an outward sign of inward grace; that is your reason for baptizing adults. For the same reason we baptize children. The moral state decides the question of baptism, and not ages or classes of persons." Now this is reasoning upon the supposition that adults and young children are in all respects alike. There are many points of difference. The adults are in a state of grace; infants are in a state of nature. Adults have been regenerated by the spirit of God; infants are yet in the flesh, and they that are in the flesh cannot please God. Adults have believed in Christ; infants have never heard of Christ, and "how can they believe in him of whom they have not heard?" While it is true, as Christ says, that those who are like children in certain respects are prepared for admission to the kingdom of heaven, and that which causes their fitness for admission, is the very thing in which they are dissimilar to infants in a state of nature. For, "Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God."

Your idea that infants, in a state of nature are fit subjects for admission into the kingdom of heaven, is opposed to your doctrine of "total depravity." If, as you preach,

all are totally depraved, how can infants, *while in a state of total depravity*, be fit subjects for admission into the kingdom? "That which is born of flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is Spirit."—John 3-36. "In Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature."—Gal. 5-15.

You contradict in your argument, both Christ and Paul, as well as your doctrine of total depravity, when you assert that infants are proper subjects for Church membership, taught in the passage, "Of such is the kingdom of heaven." If that which is born of flesh is flesh, and if they that are in the flesh cannot please God, then infants, while in a state of nature, cannot please God, and are therefore not suitable subjects for His kingdom. When you say that all infants in a state of nature, are prepared for heaven, you contradict Christ and his Apostles. But, if you mean to say that all are changed into the spiritual state after their birth, and while infants, then you contradict not only the Scriptures, but universal experience and observation. For we have never seen any one grow up holy and sinless from infancy. But if you mean to say that those only who *die* in infancy are "born of the Spirit," and are saved, we agree with you. If those only who die in infancy are regenerated, why do you insist that *all* infants are fit subjects for the ordinance? How can you tell at what hour the child may die, and who of the children will die in their infancy, and finding this how can you tell the time they experience the new birth? Whether before, or in the "article" of death? According to this theory dead infants only would be the proper ones for the ordinance, and like our Methodist brother in Asheville a year or two ago, who baptized the dead infant, this would be more consistent with your principles and less hurtful to the world, than your present practice.

But, I would ask my friend again, that if *all* infants are eligible to Church membership and to baptism, why do you

not baptize others besides the children of your members? There are thousands of children around you, but because their parents are wicked, or not among your membership, you never raise your voice in their behalf in order to put the "seal" on them also.

But to conclude this part of the reference to Dr. H.'s argument on infant membership, we ask, if infants in a state of nature are entitled to baptism, and in consequence to Church membership, why are they not also required to partake of the holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper? The Roman Apostacy, from whom you receive this rite, more consistent than you, did for many centuries admit infants to "the Eucharist." You preclude a large number of your own Church members from this solemn service, and then call us a set of "narrow-hearted bigots," because, on an entire different ground, you are not invited to the Lord's table with us.

III. "The Apostles Preached the Doctrine of Infant Church Membership." Page 97, "Armor."

Dr. H. says: "Peter in his pentecostal sermon declared, 'The promise is unto you and *your children*.' The promise referred to is that which is contained in the Abrahamic covenant.'" He says: "Never was there a better time for Peter to declare the repeal of the law requiring the children to be brought into the Church than this." . . . This passage is considered one of their strongest texts in support of infant baptism. I think we can show that the Apostle never even thought of such an absurdity. As our friend quotes only so much of this text as suits his purpose, let us examine the subject as it is. On that memorable day the people were pierced to the heart at the preaching of the Apostles, and said: "Men and brethren what shall we do?" "Then Peter said unto them, repent and be baptized, every one of you in the name of Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. For the

promise is unto you and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call."

Now it is clear as the noonday sun that the persons to be baptized were first to repent, and cannot here possibly allude to unconscious babes. But you say the promise is to your children. The term children here evidently means posterity, not infants. Nothing is more common in the Scriptures than to speak of the Jewish nation as the children of Israel. Peter says to them, "Ye are the children of the prophets." But this promise was not only to the Jews and their posterity (children) but to Gentiles, "to all that are afar off," with this restriction on the promise, "even as many as the Lord our God shall call." The Scripture goes on further to say: "Then they that gladly received his word were baptized." Infants could not "receive the word," therefore were not baptized. Those only who repented were baptized, not the "penitents and their children."

"The promise is to you and your children." What promise? Evidently the Holy Ghost. "And ye shall receive the Holy Ghost." It was not a promise of baptism. If infants were to be baptized without repentance and faith in Christ, then all the aliens and idolators among the Gentiles, for they are included in the expression "all that are afar off." There is the same authority to baptize these as the children—"you and your children and all that are afar off." Grant your position, then "all the world and the rest of mankind" are equally included in the promise, while Peter limits it to those who "repent and believe." If this text, then, is one of the strongest proofs for infant baptism, the cause of my friend is desperate indeed. But Dr. H. next refers us in support of this subject to

IV. Family Baptisms- Page 98, "Armor."

"Proofs." "And a certain woman named Lydia, a

seller of purple, of the city of Thyatira, which worshipped God, heard us: whose heart the Lord opened that she attended unto the things which were spoken of Paul. And when she was baptized and her household, she besought us, saying, If ye have judged me faithful to the Lord, come into my house and abide there. And she constrained us."—Acts 16, 14–15. Dr. H. says: "Notice, nothing is said about her family exercising any religious duty, but it is said of her, 'The Lord opened her heart, and she attended to the things spoken by Paul.' As an adult person she repented and believed; and as nothing is said about her family repenting and believing, but that they were baptized, the inference is that her family consisted of children too young to believe and that they were baptized on the faith of the mother."

So our author sticks to "inference," since he cannot find a single verse or sentence in the Scriptures in support of his infant baptism. Not one word is here said about children in Lydia's household. Before he can claim this as Scriptural authority for infant baptism, he must show that Lydia was a *mother*, and that she had children too young to believe, neither of which he can or ever will be able to prove. She may or may not have had children; she may have had a husband; she may have been a widow; she may have been an old maid; it is all a matter of "inference." She was in the city of Phillippi, some three or four hundred miles from her house, for she lived in Thyatira, away off in Asia Minor, and if she had a husband and little infants, it would have been natural for him to leave her at home with the children while he traveled abroad to sell his merchandise.

The most reasonable inference is that her household consisted of persons in her employ; that they believed and were baptized as well as Lydia. One thing is certain, whether they were the offspring or servants of Lydia, they were men, for in verse 40 of this chapter we read that as soon as Paul and Silas were liberated they returned to the

house of Lydia and saw the brethren and comforted them. There were no others there at that time whom the Apostles would call "brethren" for they were the first converts at that place and composed the household of Lydia. To seize upon this Scripture as a proof of infant baptism only shows how weak and untenable is their ground for its support. To say that the term household necessarily includes infants, the reader is reminded that there are in every neighborhood whole families in which there are no small children, and whole families have often been baptized and not a single infant among them. When there is no mention of the act claimed in the Scriptures, the burden of proof rests with our opponents.

Now we come next to consider "The Jailer's Family." "And they said, Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved, and thy house. And they spake unto him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his house. And he took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes; and was baptized, he and all his, straightway." Acts XVI–31–34. Dr. H. adds: "The term 'household' in the ordinary sense includes all the children of the family. When it is said: 'Joseph nourished his father and his brethren, and all his father's household with bread according to their families,' little children are included." . . . . He says: "Many attempts have been made to prove that there were no children in these families, but all such attempts are vain." The probabilities are against all such reasoning. Besides these families, Paul baptized the "household of Stephanas." . . . He says: "Who can believe that not one infant was found in all these families," &c. He says: "The practice of infant baptism does not rest on inference," &c.

This part of Dr. H.'s argument is weak indeed. Any one who reads the account can see that infants are not alluded to in the jailer's family. Paul and Silas "spake unto him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his

house." Surely they would not preach to infants. It is said that "the jailer rejoiced, believing in God, with all his house." Could infants believe and rejoice? It is said of Crispus: "He believed on the Lord with all his house." Acts. 18–8. As to the household of Stephanas, it is said that they "addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints." How could infants minister to the saints? Now in all these cases of household baptisms, they are said to believe, to rejoice, to administer to the wants of the saints—not one word about the parents bringing their children to have them baptized. It is clear then that they either had none, or if they did there were no Pedo-Baptists at that time. There is no allusion in all these passages to any "vows, promises and obligations" made and assumed by their parents or sponsors at their baptism. There is scarcely a Baptist minister of much prominence and who has advanced in life, who has not baptized more entire households than are mentioned in the New Testament, and thus upsets our friend's assertion when he says: "Now, if our modern preachers follow them, (Apostles) they will baptize entire families, and if they go on in doing so, it is certain that they will baptize infants." . . .

In conclusion here, celebrated Pedo-Baptist writers shall speak for us. Neander, to whom we have before alluded, as being undoubtedly the first Church historian of his age, speaking of these household baptisms, says: "We cannot infer the existence of infant baptism from the existence of the baptism of whole families, for the passage in 1 Cor. 16-15, shows the fallacy of such a conclusion, as from that it appears that the whole family of Stephanas, who were baptized by Paul, consisted of adults." (See page 101, 102, Planting and Training of the Church.)

Dr. Wall, in his "History of Infant Baptism," on the very first page of his preface says that "among all the persons that are recorded as baptized by the Apostles, there is no express mention of any infant." We might quote

from others, celebrated in the world of scholars, of similar import, but this is enough.

Dr. H. says, in his "Historical Statement," (page 99, "Armor.") "From the year 400, A. D., to 1150, no society of men in all the period of 750 years ever pretended to say that it was unlawful to baptize infants. Irenaeus, who lived in the second century, declares expressly that the Church learned from the Apostles to baptize children. So far as history affords any light, the baptism of children was practiced down to the eleventh century. About 1130 a body of Christians called Waldenses entertained the idea that infants were incapable of salvation and therefore rejected infant baptism. About 1520 the Ana-Baptists renewed this objection, which the Baptists took up and stoutly maintain."

We pause here to notice the above astonishing statement.

We have followed him through the Scriptures and ask the unprejudiced reader if it has not been shown conclusively that there is neither precept nor example for infant baptism, in all God's word? It is nowhere hinted, much less stated, that infants are entitled to this ordinance. It is nowhere enjoined upon parents to see that their infants have this rite. The teachings of the Scriptures are neither doubtful nor contradictory. Doctors of Divinity may contradict each other and themselves, but God's word is not a book of doubtful oracles. It speaks plainly. "Though a fool he may not err therein."

Reader, when you are told that the Scriptures teach infant baptism, ask the preacher to show it to you. If it is there it can be found. But he will perhaps tell you that it is *inferred* from the commission, "Go baptize," &c.; but you will tell him this is only a commission to baptize believers; it does not say believers and their children. "He that believeth and is baptized," &c. Then he will refer you to Matt. 19, Jesus said: "Suffer little children to come

unto me," &c., and you reply they did not come to be baptized, but to be prayed for. "And he laid his hands on them and departed." Not a word about baptism here.

Then he will point you to Peter's sermon: "The promise is to you and your children." But you will tell him this is a promise of the "Holy Ghost," not of baptism, and this is not to unconscious babes; it is limited to them "whom the Lord our God shall call," to those who can hear and believe. But he will tell you that whole families were baptized, and with an air of triumph say there must have been little babes in some of them. But when you turn and read, you find that all who were baptized in these instances were able to hear and believe in God, rejoiced in God, spake with tongues, glorified God, ministered to the saints, and in Lydia's family they are called "brethren;" and when you reflect for a moment you call to mind a number of families who have been baptized within your own observation which contain no infants in them. And failing in this—finding neither precept nor example in the New Testament, not even an allusion to infant baptism—he will tell you that it is certainly taught somewhere, for unless it were, Wesley, Coke and Asbury, and their successors, our bishops and elders and circuit riders, all good men, would not have practiced it. He will refer you to the Old Testament and tell you about the covenant with Abraham, the seal of circumcision, and that it was applied to children; and then argue that this covenant includes Christians too; for Paul says, "All that believe are the children of believing Abraham," and if his children by nature were circumcised, his children by faith must be baptized. You say, very true, his children by faith are to be baptized, but they are believers, not the infant offspring of believers. Moreover, the children of the Jews were circumcised because God expressly commanded it to be done, and it was confined to the male children. But Christian parents were never commanded to baptize their infants. Believers only are commanded to be

baptized, and this virtually excludes infants who are not capable of believing. Not a single infant was ever baptized by Christ or his Apostles. Unless Christ commanded it or authorized it, it is simply impious to impose it on fond parents, and cause them to sin against God, even though great and good men have taught it in opposition to the Word of God.

If baptism sealed the conversion of children, if by the act itself, they were regenerated, as was first taught by Wesley and others, there would be some excuse for this course, but they do not say now that it does have that effect, for all who observe know, that a baptized child grows up a sinner just as the one who is not baptized. No man or woman believes that the sprinkling of a little water on a baby's face changes its heart, and makes it a new creature in Christ. We say it is a sin, because it brings into the visible Church, unconverted, unbelieving sinners, who grow up in the church as such, and in this way has been the cause of untold suffering, enough to make the true followers of Christ to weep tears of blood. For the first two or three centuries there is no mention of it in the churches; the members were all professed believers and were shining lights in the world, holding the ordinances as they received them from the Apostles.

But when infants began to be brought into the Church its spirituality was gone. In the course of a few generations, like the national churches of Europe at the present day, it had swallowed up the world. No Pagan, not even the tiger-hearted Nero himself, was so cruel in his persecution of the Christians, as this body of baptized infants became, when it grew up to power and influence. Nothing which the most infernal hatred could suggest, and the most diabolical ingenuity could invent was thought too hard for these baptized ones to inflict on those who professed faith in Christ, and would not conform to this unscriptural rite of infant baptism. This has continued through every age.

It has not been confined to Roman Catholics. Whenever and wherever, those who receive infant members, gain the power, they have become the persecutors of those who denied its divine authority. They were driven out to live in the caves and dens of the earth, hunted down like wild beasts, and thousands were slain for the testimony of Jesus; not by Pagans; not by infidels; not by the non-professor and people of the world; but by those made members of the Church by this "blessed" ordinance of infant baptism!

Our Pilgrim Fathers of New England, persecuted the Baptists and the Quakers and condemned them to banishment and death.

Cranmer was officious in bringing the Baptists to the stake.

Calvin procured the execution of one Servetus for his religious opinion.

Luther urged the princes to persecute those who would not conform to his views. All these were the advocates of infant baptism.

Because the Baptists will not fall down and worship this child of the "Harlot of Babylon," they are made the butt and ridicule of Pedo-Baptists in their sermons and books, in their conversations at the fireside—everywhere—and would, if they had the power, exterminate them from the face of the earth.

But Hr. H. says: "Irenaeus, who lived in the second century, declares expressly that the Church learned from the Apostles to baptize children." Now we say Irenaeus declared no such thing, and defy our friend to prove it. It is said dying men will catch at straws. The cause must be a weak one indeed which requires such support. For here is what Irenaeus wrote, so often alluded to by our opponents in support of infant baptism: "Christ passed through all ages of man, that He might save all by Himself; all, I say, who are by Him *regenerated* to God—infants, and

little ones, and children, and youths, and persons advanced in years." I have here quoted the whole passage so often resorted to by Pedo-Baptists for aid and comfort since they cannot find it in God's word.

Dr. Doddridge, a learned Pedo-Baptist, says in reference to it: "We have only a Latin translation of this work, and some critics have supposed this passage spurious; or allowing it to be genuine, it will not be granted that to be *regenerated* signifies baptized." (Page 493, Doddridge's Miscellaneous Works.)

Another learned writer, Winer, says: "Irenaeus does not mention it (infant baptism) as has been supposed." The term is *renascor* in the original and means to regenerate. How they can get comfort here I can't see, unless regeneration and infant baptism are one and the same. Besides, they would make Christ the administrator, while it is said, "Christ baptized not." So we see Irenaeus does not say one word about baptism.

But Dr. Hudson, in his "Historical Statement," admits there is no trace of infant baptism prior to the year A. D. 400, but from then up to 1150 he says, "no society of men ever pretended to say that it was unlawful to baptize infants." And on page 100 he says: "Since the Reformation of Luther by far the greater part of Christians have believed and practiced the baptism of infants; that the number of Christians in the whole world is put down by Prof. Schem as 418,000,000; all of those, except about 4,000,000 belonging mainly to the Baptist Church, believe in and practice infant baptism."

Now let us see. Soon after the Reformation the Pedo-Baptists of Germany formed a project to collect and embody in a permanent form the facts in the history of the early Christian Churches. A large number of the most learned men in all Europe engaged in this investigation. All the great libraries and stores of knowledge were explored by them. Lutheran princes and wealthy nobles joined

in the enterprise. Neither money nor labor was wanting to carry it on. Their plan was to take up each century by itself. This work was published at Magdeburg, and its authors are called the "*Magdeburg Centuriators.*" It was executed with great care and has ever been regarded as a most reliable record of Church history. The following language is found in this history: "They (the Apostles) baptized only the adult or aged, whether Jews or Gentiles. As to the baptism of infants we have no example. As to the manner of baptizing, it was by dipping or plunging into the water."

Thus they speak of the first century, and of the second century they say: "It does not appear from any approved authors that there was any change or variation from the former century in regard to baptism."

The learned Erasmus, says in his notes on Romans the 6th. "It is nowhere expressed in the Apostolic writings that they baptized children."

John Calvin, the founder of the Presbyterian Church, says: "It is nowhere expressed by the Evangelists that any one infant was baptized."

Kitto's Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature, is a standard work for Pedo-Baptists. A good Methodist friend of mine has it. A short time ago I looked into it, and was astonished to find this honest statement: (Page 287, vol. 2.) "Infant baptism was established neither by Christ nor his Apostles. . . . . In support of a contrary opinion the advocates (of infant baptism) in former ages, (now hardly any) used to appeal to Matt. 19, 14, "Suffer little children" &c.; but their strongest argument in its favor is the regulation of baptizing all the members of a household or family; (I Cor. 16, 17, Acts 8, 8,) but in none of these instances has it been proved that there were little children among them. And even if there were, there was no necessity for excluding them from baptism in plain words, since such exclusion was understood as a matter of course."

This is interesting reading from high authority. He goes on to tell how and why it was introduced amid the corruptions that crept into the churches. Turn to it and read, Doctor, for I suppose you have the work in your library.

Turn to the *North British Review*, (August, 1852,) the organ of the Presbyterians in Scotland, and read: "Scripture knows nothing of the baptism of infants. There is absolutely not a trace of it to be found in the New Testament. . . . . History confirms the inference drawn from the sacred volume. Infant baptism cannot be traced higher than the middle of the second century, and even then it was not universal. Some, indeed, have argued that in the silence of Scripture, it is fair to presume that a custom whose existence is sure in the second century must have descended from the Apostles; but the presumption is wholly the other way." Such is the language of this eminent writer, Rev. Dr. Hanna, a son-in-law of that noble Presbyterian divine, Dr. Chalmers.

We have already shown when infant baptism was first introduced and the reasons which gave rise to it; that about the year 417, the Pope issued his decree against the Ana-Baptists for refusing to sanction infant baptism, and thousands of them were banished or put to death. And yet Dr. H. would have you believe that there was no opposition to it up to the eleventh century when the "Waldenses rejected it; that about 1520 the Ana-Baptists renewed this objection, which the Baptists took up and stoutly maintain." He surely reads history through dimmed glasses.

If the reader will have the patience to follow us to the close of this little volume we will prove that the Baptists, tho' in ancient times called by different names, have stood up against the world, the flesh and the devil, as they do now, for lo these eighteen hundred years, and solitary and alone have handed down to us in its purity the Book of Books, and alone have kept the doctrines of Christ and His

Apostles as they were once delivered to the Saints.

The Doctor now gives us a few words on "Objections," (P. 100.) He says: "It is asked, what is the benefit of baptism to children? what does the child know about it?" "But don't you see," he says, "that these objections bear just as hard against circumcision instituted by God as against infant baptism? What was the benefit of circumcision to children only eight days old? What did these infants know about it? We answer, God saw benefit in it, else He would not have commanded it. Again, the stale objection is: 'There is no express command for infant baptism.' But there is a command for circumcision in the Old Testament, and baptism takes the place of circumcision."

We reply, the Bible nowhere says that baptism has taken the place of circumcision, nor can it so be inferred. How do they know it to be so? The Apostles and primitive Christians never heard that it did, and never practiced it. Peter knew nothing of it, otherwise when they of the circumcision contended with him, (Acts XI) he would have told them that those who had been baptized could not be considered uncircumcised and unclean, since baptism had taken the place of circumcision. Paul and Barnabas, and the Apostles and Elders, at Jerusalem, knew nothing of its substitution for circumcision, or else how natural it would have been for them to have stated the fact, and thus silenced the Judaizing teachers. (Acts 15.)

Again: it is certain that baptism did not come in the room of circumcision, because, those who had been circumcised were also baptized, and some who had been baptized were also circumcised. Christ and has Apostles had been circumcised in their infancy, yet they were subsequently baptized. How can they reconcile such fiction? But he says there is a *command* for circumcision. That is true; it was to be done when the children were *eight days old.* Only the *male* children were commanded to receive this rite and all the slaves: "he that is born in thy house or bought

with money of any stranger," &c. (Gen. 17.) The ceremony was performed in their houses by their parents. So if baptism is a substitute for it, it should be confined to males, to children when they were *eight days* old, and to grown up and old men who are in the employ of these religious parents, however wicked, for the command also included them in the Abrahamic covenant. It must also be performed by the *parents* of the children *at home* to carry out the similarity; it was not commanded to be done by the *priests* and in their Synagogues.

But as to the "benefits" or object of circumcision, it is clearly taught that it was to keep up the nationality of the Jews, and was a sign of the covenant made to Abraham (see verse 8) that he should possess the land of Canaan for an inheritance, and on his part the condition was that every man-child should be circumcised. But what in the name of common sense has all this to do with Christian baptism? If it had not been introduced from the idea that in some way baptism was essential to salvation, we never should have heard of such a thing as infant baptism.

If we were to suppose the principles of Pedo-Baptists to prevail in the world, where would believers' baptism be? It would soon be banished from the face of the earth. There would be no gospel baptism. One of the institutions for which our Saviour labored, suffered, toiled and died, would have no place among Christians. What a horrid idea! For human tradition to array itself in opposition to one of the ordinances of heaven and destroy it, is enough to make the humble follower of Christ, and those who love His appearing, to wage an unceasing war against it! Just think for a moment. Let all the children in the world be baptized, and you could no longer preach, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved;" "Repent and be baptized;" "Then they that gladly received his word were baptized;" "They were baptized, both men and women." There would be no men and women to be baptized, for they all

were baptized in their childhood. It would not be necessary to believe, repent and be baptized, for such preaching would be nonsense. There would be no distinction between the Church and the world; the whole world would be Church members, for it is admitted that when children are baptized they are Church members. And when Christ said: "The world hath hated them, because they are not of the world, even as I am not of the world," (Jno. 17–14) could no longer be said, for all the world would belong to the Church. And then how would these texts sound: "The world hath not known me," (verse 25,) "The world by wisdom knew not God," (I Cor. 1–21,) "The whole world lieth in wickedness?" There would be no world to preach to, as every body would belong to the Church.

Again, the Doctor says: "But waiving this point, will you show an express command for admitting women to the communion table?" and adds: "There is none." We must notice this FEMALE COMMUNION.

Another Pedo-Baptist writer says: "It is nowhere recorded that the Apostles administered the ordinance of the Lord's Supper to women, yet no one doubts that they did, and no one thinks of excluding women from this ordinance because of the omission in the record."

It is thus our opponents argue to establish infant baptism. But if they can show as much proof for it as we can show for female communion, we will surrender. Let us try it, and see if we can't show that the Apostles did administer the Lord's Supper to females, and enjoined it on them to partake of it equally and as expressly as it was enjoined on the males.

1st. Females were baptized and added to the churches. Lydia was baptized, "and believers were the more added to the Church, multitudes both of men and women."—Acts 14. "But when they believed Phillip, ... they were baptized, both men and women."—8–12. But it is nowhere positively stated that infants were baptized and added to

the Church. "These all continued with one accord in prayer and supplication, with the women and Mary, the mother of Jesus." And this you cannot say of infants. Paul enjoined it upon females to partake of the Supper. He says: "For I have received of the Lord that which I delivered unto you." "For we being many, are one bread and one body, for we are all partakers of that one bread." He was writing to the Corinthian Church, which was composed in part of females and the word all included them. Again: "And they continued steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread and in prayers." "And all that believed were together and had all things common."—Acts 2, 42-44. There is no distinction here as to sex. The passage as clearly includes females as males. "And upon the first day of the week when the disciples came together to break bread," &c.—Acts 20-7. The term disciples includes females, for Luke expressly calls them so. "Now, there was at Joppa a certain disciple named Tabitha."—Acts 9-36. Whenever the disciples are mentioned the reference is to females as well as to males. "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples if ye have love one to another," is said equally of both sexes.

And I will here conclude this subject of female communion, by offering another proof which completely upsets my friend's assertion that there is no express command for admitting women to the communion. We have shown already that there is as much authority for women as men to partake of the Lord's Supper. Wherever reference is made to the duties exclusively of males in the New Testament, the term *aner* is invariably used in the Greek, which means man and man only. But when the Lord's Supper is spoken of, the term *anthropos* is used, which includes both sexes. For instance: "Let a man (*anthropos*) examine himself and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup." The Greek lexicons all say that *anthropos* is common gender and means mankind, the human race.

&c. The same word is used by Christ when he speaks of himself as the Son of Man, when we know that he was of the seed of woman, the son of Mary, but not of Joseph. If you deny this, then you cannot prove that woman is saved at all! There is "one mediator between God and man," (*anthropos*) but there is no mediator for the woman. "Lord what is man (*anthropos*) that thou art mindful of him." "Man, (*anthropos*) that is born of woman is of few days, and full of trouble." And even to this day, we use the term man in the same sense, which in a general way, means also woman. And to cap the climax, the Scripture makes it too plain to even discuss the matter further. "So God created man in his own image; in the image of God created he him, male and female created he them." And Paul settles it, (Gal. 3-28.) "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female," &c.

In a word, let a very distinguished Pedo-Baptist writer answer my friend. He says: "I am not going to take the ground which by some Pedo-Baptists has been assumed, *viz:* that we have no direct and explicit authority for the admission of women to the Lord's table; because it has always appeared to me hardly consistent with manly fairness and candor, and calculated to expose to a sneer rather than recommend to acceptance, the cause it is meant to support."—Dr. Wardlaw.

And lastly on this point—that there is no command for admitting women to the communion table—hear how Dr. H. contradicts himself. On page 41 of his book, he says: "Both the bread and wine were originally administered by our Lord to the Apostles, and both elements were *ordered* to be given to the lay people until the coming of Christ. The command is, '*Drink all* of you.'" Now, how will you reconcile your own statements, Doctor? You declare here by emphasizing the words, "*Drink all,*" that the command of our Savior embraced all the members of the Church.

And are not women members as well as men? And yet you say on page 100 that there is no command for admitting them! We leave you to extricate yourself the best you can.

Again he says: "There is no command requiring baptism as a pre-requisite to the communion, yet a certain Church acts as though there was. There is not a remote hint, much less a command, in the Bible, authorizing the practice of *close communion*, yet the very Church that objects to infant baptism because there is no express, "Thus saith the Lord," rigidly enforces the law of close communion without a single hint of Bible authority for so doing." —"Armor," pages 100, 101. Here the Doctor closes his argument on infant baptism.

In reply to this last assertion of his, we are relieved from a portion of our task by introducing to the reader two of the most fair-minded and distinguished Pedo-Baptist writers of modern date, the one a Methodist and the other a Presbyterian. What they say shall be our answer.. First, the Rev. F. G. Hibbard, who has no superior in the M. E. Church, is the author of a book published by the Methodist Book Concern, and is therefore endorsed as much higher authority by the Methodist Church than Dr. H. Here is what he says: "Before entering upon the argument before us it is but just to remark that in one principle the Baptist and Pedo-Baptist Churches agree. They both agree in rejecting from communion at the table of the Lord, and in denying the rights of Church fellowship to all who have not been baptized. Valid baptism they consider as essential to constitute visible Church membership. This also we hold. The only question, then, that here divides us, is, 'What is essential to valid baptism?' The Baptists, in passing the sweeping sentence of disfranchisement upon all other Christian Churches, have only acted upon a principle held in common with all other Christian Churches, viz: that baptism is essential to church membership. They have denied our baptism, and as unbaptized persons we have been excluded

from their table. That they err greatly in their views of Christian baptism, we of course, believe. But according to their views of baptism, they certainly are consistent in restricting thus their communion.

"We would not be understood as passing a judgment of approval upon their course; but we say their views of baptism force them upon the ground of strict communion, and herein they act upon the same principles as other Churches, that is to say, they admit only those whom they deem baptized persons to the communion table. Of course, they must be their own judges as to what baptism is. It is evident that, according to their views of baptism, we can admit them to our communion; but with their views of baptism, it is equally evident they can never reciprocate the courtesy. And the charge of close communion is no more applicable to the Baptists than to us, inasmuch as the question of Church fellowship with them is determined by as liberal principles as it is with any other Protestant Church, so far, I mean, as the present subject is concerned; that is, it is determined by valid baptism.

"Now, this being the case, does it not become a measure of responsible moment to decide upon the question of the mode of baptism? Indeed, so awful are the aspects of this subject, that thousands have feared to assume a decided position in reference to it. They have held to exclusive immersion, and at the same time have held to Catholic communion, or communion with persons who have not been immersed, an anomaly and absurdity that presents a singular contrast to the characteristic symmetry of Christian theology."

I don't think any Baptist could state it more plainly and in more elegant language. Those who hold to immersion as the only mode, and yet practice open communion, are well characterized as forming an "anomaly and absurdity" among Christians. This thing of close *communion* as practiced by the Baptists, and so often misrepresented

by Pedo-Baptist speakers to prejudice the minds of the people against them, will never be surrendered as long as there is a class of Christians who adhere strictly to God's word as their guide. Second. We submit the declaration of the Rev. Dr. Griffin, who ranks among the highest Presbyterian authors.

He says: "I agree with the advocates for close communion in two points: 1st. That baptism is the initiating ordinance which introduces us into the visible Church; of course, where there is no baptism, there are no visible Churches. 2nd. That we ought not to commune with those who are not baptized, and of course, are not Church members, even if we regard them as Christians. Should a pious Quaker so far depart from his principles as to wish to commune with me at the Lord's Table, while yet he refused to be baptized, I could not receive him; because there is such a relationship established between the two ordinances that I have no right to separate them, in other words, I have no right to send the sacred elements out of the Church. The only question then is, whether those associations of evangelical Christians that call themselves Churches, and that practice sprinkling, are real Churches of Christ; in other words, whether sprinkling is valid baptism. If nothing but immersion is baptism, there is no visible Church except among the Baptists."

These two learned Christian writers, though differing with us as to what constitutes gospel baptism, fairly and nobly put us right before the world on the subject of close communion.

Dr. Hudson says: "There is not a remote hint in the Bible, authorizing the practice of close communion."

Dr. Hibbard, of much higher authority in the Methodist Church, says: "The charge of close communion is no more applicable to the Baptists than to us."

If this be true, then, as stated by these eminent writers, it comes of an unchristian spirit in Dr. Hudson to call us

a set of "narrow-hearted bigots" for practicing and carrying out the very same principle which his Church does. In conclusion: while we extend the hand of Christian fellowship to all our brethren of every name, we reserve the same right to ourselves claimed by them, viz: to be our own judges as to whom we receive into our Church fellowship. We do not, as Dr. Hudson asserts, believe either in "infant damnation or in infant baptism."

We not only love our little ones with the warm tenderness which God has implanted in our hearts, but we love them because our gracious Redeemer loved them, took them in his arms, prayed for them, blessed them and died for them. But also because He did not baptize them, appoint their place in the Church, and put them under responsibilities beyond their power, neither do we. We cannot see how infant baptism brings a babe into some new covenant relation to Christ which did not before exist. If our babes die unbaptized, we believe they are saved by the grace of Jesus without faith, repentance, or any other religious act. We cannot feel the consistency of baptizing the infant out of the Church and of leaving him there till, by conversion, he is allowed to come in, because his conversion has made him fit for heaven.

Nor can we allow him to fall into the dangerous notion, that because he was baptized in infancy he has in some way become the child of a covenant with God, to which he was not a party, and so be deluded by the conception that now he is not to be converted and saved exactly as all unbaptized children are. If his baptism has engrafted him into Christ and His Church, he must feel that there is a moral relation existing between him and God, which unbaptized children do not sustain. We should leave this matter to the faith of the child when he can, of his own choice, follow Him in baptism, a renewed and willing disciple.

We object to infant baptism, then, because it vitiates the purity of Christ's Church, as is seen in all the State

Churches of Europe; that it attaches an importance to baptism which does not belong to it, and so perverts the design of this gospel ordinance by exalting it above its proper position; and in that it places the baptized child in a relation to which he is a stranger in the gospel. It assumes that he is neither fit for heaven if he dies unbaptized, nor fit for the full fellowship of the Church on earth if he is baptized. Infant baptism among Protestants is on the wane and must go as a thing of the past, while we, as Baptists, loyal to our principles, our God, our country, and our ancestry, pray for its speedy overthrow. We do not forget that Baptist bones have lain for ages bleaching in the Alpine snows of Switzerland; that Baptist sobs still haunt the coal holes of Bonner in which they were thrown for resisting this dogma of Rome; that the praises of Baptist martyrs are still echoing up and down *Lollard's Tower* to the music of their chains; and that the pavements of Smithfield still cry out to the fitful winds which flitted Baptist ashes up and down over the heads of their bloody persecutors.

CHAPTER XII.

The Rise and Progress of the Baptists.

The writer now enters upon this closing chapter with deep and increasing interest. The genealogy of our ancestors forms a pleasant theme, especially when we can read of their heroic deeds and hair-breadth escapes in times of great danger. The child delights to hear his parents relate some thrilling story of their grandsires of colonial times, and kindles with enthusiasm as the simple but touching incidents are related to him. The Chinese hold to ancestral worship and can trace their parentage, it is said, back to a thousand years, while we, many of us, scarcely know who our grandfathers were.

Still there is an increasing desire to learn something of the lives and times of those who have preceded us in the race of human existence. The history of men and nations has employed the grandest talent of all ages and of all languages. Our libraries are filled with their works, and eagerly sought and read by people of both sexes.

Now, while the student, from youth to manhood, revels in historical literature of this kind, it seems strange indeed, that those who profess Christianity should be acquainted not only with the history of their own country, but even with that of the remotest nations and should at the same time seek to know nothing of Church history. Except the study of the Bible, the life of Christ, the writings and acts of the Apostles, what could be more intensely interesting to the Christian than the study of the history of the churches which succeeded those planted in the days of the

Apostles, and which have existed for eighteen hundred years, preserving pure the faith and practice of their primitive fathers, through all the dark ages and persecutions down to the present time? Is it not interesting to know that the kingdom spoken of by Daniel, that was to stand forever, and ultimately to fill the whole earth, is daily fulfilling that remarkable prophecy? Is not the heart of the true Christian made to rejoice in tracing back the history of the Church, when he sees the declaration of the Savior, and His promise to the first Church organized still verified: "The gates of hell shall not prevail against it?"

To learn that ever since the rise of the "Man of Sin," there has been a succession of "witnesses for God," "witnesses for the truth," who have kept the ordinances and discipline which the Master and inspired Apostles committed to their sacred keeping.

Who can read, unmoved, the history of our brethren, as they bore themselves as true and faithful witnesses for the truth, when the powers of darkness and the gates of hell, ceased not in their attempts to prevail against them? When "Apostate Rome, for 1300 years has employed armies and crusades, inquisitions and tortures, prisons, famine, and the stake, to break in pieces this kingdom, and exterminate these witnesses from the face of the earth? Will you not ask who have been these suffering witnesses, during the past eighteen centuries? In what lands and by what names have they been preserved, nourished from the face of the serpent, in the mountains and caves of the wilderness?" Will you not seek to know what were the peculiar doctrines, which in every age distinguished this body of witnesses, under what form of Church government did they exist, how did they observe the ordinances of God's house, did they admit of human traditions, did they recognize human legislation in the churches? Are not these questions of paramount concern to all Christian denominations, since, if not from the New Testament, certainly

from the history of these, the form, subjects, ordinances and doctrines of the true churches of Christ can be learned?

The study, then, of the history and lives and testimony of those preceding us, who have been "faithful and true," is certainly of great advantage. Did not Paul recount the faith and sufferings and patience of the holy men and prophets who had lived before his day, to animate the zeal of his brethren? So we may study with great advantage the history of holy men and martyrs, through whom the Church of Christ and its doctrines and ordinances have been transmitted to us in their primitive integrity and purity.

Who can imagine the feelings of the Christian traveller visiting those Alpine hills in which the witnesses of Jesus hid and were nourished in those fearful times? Wandering through those mountains and deep forests, he enters perhaps, the very caverns in which they hid and which they made to echo with their songs of praise. If a visit to the homes of the ancient patriots and philosophers of Athens, the rostrums from which they spake, the tombs in which they slept, could so influence the heart and ardor of Cicero, in imitation of their virtues, how must a visit to the vales of Piedmont, and the mountains of Wales, affect the heart and mind of the Christian of these times? And especially if he be a Baptist, would his heart warm up with sympathy and amazement while contemplating the lives and characters of his brethren, who gave up their lives in order to preserve and transmit, pure and unmixed with human tradition, the principles which Baptists still maintain!

For more than a century our opponents have made continuous efforts to depreciate the claims of Baptists to ancient origin. Since they cannot claim an origin prior to the days of Luther, Calvin and the Wesleys, they seem determined that no one shall believe that the Baptists shall claim an origin beyond the days of Roger Williams. But we shall attempt briefly to show in the following pages that

the Baptists alone of all denominations, had their *rise* with John, the forerunner of Christ, and have maintained in continued succession, the principles and faith of the Apostles down to the present time.

Mosheim, that great and learned historian, says in his Vol. IV, page 427: "The true origin of that sect which acquired the name of Ana-Baptists, by their administering anew the rite of baptism to those who came over to their communion, and derived that of Menonists from that famous man, *is hid in the remote depths of antiquity*." And Mosheim was a Lutheran.

Zwingulius, who lived contemporary with Luther, said: "Ana-baptism is no novelty, but for 300 years has caused great disturbance in the Church, and has acquired such strength that the attempt, in this age, to contend with it, appeared vain and futile."

Hear what Cardinal Hosius says: "If the truth of religion were to be judged of by the readiness and cheerfulness which a man of any sect shows in suffering, then the opinion and persuasion of no sect can be truer and surer than that of the Ana-Baptists, since there are none, for these 1200 years past, that have been more generally punished, or that have more cheerfully and steadfastly undergone, and even offered themselves to the most cruel sorts of punishment, than these people.

The author of the above passage was the most learned Catholic of his day, was the President of that celebrated Council of Trent in the year 1560. The reader will bear in mind that the name Ana-Baptist was applied to our ancestors because they required *re-baptism* of all those who left the Catholic Church and asked admittance into theirs, just as we do in this day of all who come over to our faith from other denominations.

While, then, the Protestant Church must date its origin from the 19th day of April, A. D. 1529, that memorable day on which fourteen cities of Germany PROTESTED against

a decree of the Diet of Spires, which had met in the March preceding; while the Presbyterian Church must date its origin from the autumn of 1537, the year in which John Calvin published his Confession of Faith after his public debate with Peter Caroli, and constituted his first church in Geneva; whilst the Scotch Presbyterians must date their origin to John Knox, A. D. 1558, and the English Presbyterians from the year 1572, when a small church was first organized in Wadsworth, a village near London; while the Seceders must date their origin in 1733, when Erskine, Wilson and Fisher were excluded from the regular Presbyterian Church and organized one of their own; the Methodists from John Wesley in the year 1729; the Quakers from George Fox in 1625 in England; we say, while all these sects are of recent origin, not one of them yet 400 years old, not one of them able to furnish a model of their peculiarities from Scripture, or antiquity, greater than we have stated, the Baptists can trace their origin to apostolic times, and produce unequivocal testimony of their existence in every century down to the present time; and the model of their peculiarities is found plainly laid down in the New Testament.

The distinguishing features and principles of the Baptists may be laid down as way-marks to guide us in tracing their rise and progress from the beginning of the Christian era, and may here be stated in a few and simple lines:

1st. Immersion, the only baptism taught in the New Testament.

2nd. Believers the only Scriptural subjects of baptism.

3rd. Baptized believers alone compose the Church.

4th. Freedom of conscience and entire separation from Church and State.

Now all who believe and practice the principles laid down above are Baptists and all who do not are not Baptists. In this way we can show that there has been a regular succession of Christian people who have strictly ad-

hered to these principles through each succeeding age from John the Baptist down to the 19th century.

But to show what succession really is we must go to the sources of Church history and examine the faith and practice of those various Churches claiming to be Apostolic.

For the first one hundred years we have chiefly in the Acts of the Apostles, as recorded by St. Luke, the early history of the Church at Antioch, where the first tendency to Judaism was manifested. The Apostles and Church at Jerusalem had been appealed to about the trouble. They called a meeting. "The apostles, and elders and brethren send greeting unto the brethren which are of the Gentiles in Antioch and Syria, and of Silicia. For as much as we have heard that certain which went out from us have troubled you with words subverting your souls, saying you must be circumcised and keep the law, to whom we gave no such commandment." Now if such was the condition of the Church at Antioch with Paul and Peter and Barnabas in its midst, what may we expect after the lapse of 60 years, when Paul and Peter were long since dead? For it was about 60 years after these occurrences alluded to in Acts, and in Paul's letter to the Galatians, that a remarkable man whose name was Ignatius was pastor of the Church at Antioch and is the author of several Epistles, which have been found and translated into English.

In the year 107, Trajan, Emperor of Rome, while on his march against the Parthians, entered the city of Antioch. He ordered Pliny and his other generals "not to seek out the Christians, but if information was lodged against them they must be punished." Ignatius informed against himself and declared his faith before the Emperor. He was sentenced to be carried to Rome and thrown to the wild beasts. While on his way he is said to have written letters to the Ephesians, to the Romans, Polycarp and others which are now found in our large libraries. The faith of this man was very strong, for in his letter to the Romans,

he says: "I write to the churches and I declare to all that willingly I die for God, if it be that you hinder me not. Let me be devoured of the beasts, by whose means I am enabled to obtain God. I am God's wheat, and by the teeth of the beasts am I ground, that I may be found God's pure bread. Rather entreat kindly the beasts that they may be a grave for me, and may leave nothing of my body. Then I shall be in truth a disciple of Jesus Christ when the world seeth not even my body. . . . . May I be rejoiced of the beasts prepared for me! and I pray that they be found ready for me, and quickly devour me," &c. This remarkable letter is too long to quote here. In these letters Ignatius writes in the same style of the Apostles. He recognizes the independence of the Churches—that each Church had its own pastor and managed its own affairs as Baptist Churches do now.

It was during this period that the Jews had a contest with the Syrians, about Caesarea, which city stood on the boundaries of both kingdoms and was claimed alike by both. The dispute was referred to the Emperor Nero, who decided in favor of Syria; the Jews flew to arms, butchered Romans and Syrians, which brought the combined armies of Rome and Syria against them, and after a siege of five months, the city and temple of Jerusalem were utterly destroyed, eleven hundred thousand lives were lost, and ninety thousand persons led into captivity. Thus after fifteen hundred years of existence the Jewish nation lost its distinction. (For a vivid and fearful description of the destruction of Jerusalem read Josephus.)

After the destruction of the Jewish capital the churches enjoyed peace for several years, till about the close of the first century. There is no mention either in the Scriptures or in the writings of the early fathers, of any other baptism but immersion during this century. The first mention of this divine ordinance, is found in Matthew the third chapter. John was the first to administer it. The way of John's

administering it occasioned his being called the Baptist: or as the Dutch called him, the Dipper. The river Jordan was the stream first selected as a most suitable water in which to immerse those who repented of their sins. John had been preaching and baptizing about six months when Jesus presented himself a candidate for this ordinance, and John led him down into the sacred river and immersed him. Such is the language of Scripture. There is nothing more certain than that immersion was the only baptism known up the close of the first century.

Barnabas, the companion of Paul, says: "Blessed are they who putting their trust in the cross, descend into the water."

Hermes, whom Paul salutes in the church at Rome, has left on record the same idea of immersing the candidates in water: "Men descend into water under an obligation to death, but ascend out of it again to a new life." The most authentic historians declare immersion to have been the only mode during the first three centuries.

Neander says it was "perfomed by immersion."

Mosheim, in his great history, says it was done "by immersing the candidate wholly in water."

Bingham, one of the best authorities who has ever written on the subject, and a Pedo-Baptist, says: "As this dipping was the original Apostolical practice so it continued the universal practice of the church for many ages."

That fine critic and scholar, Professor Stuart, had before him a class in college reading and translating from the Greek Testament. When they came to the 16th verse of the 16th chapter of Mark, one of the students translated, "He that believeth and is *sprinkled* shall be saved." The professor replied, "*Sprinkled* is not correct." The student said "it was the practice of their denomination." "That is not the question," replied the professor, "You are now translating the Greek Testament, and the word means immerse." He was too honest as a scholar to degrade his

reputation to gratify denominational custom.

We might multiply quotations in proof of immersion's being the only mode of baptism in early times, and in this particular the Baptists of this day are the same in faith and practice.

2nd. Believers are the only Scriptural subjects of baptism.

This is one of the cardinal differences between Baptists and other denominations; for they hold that believers only should receive the ordinance and it was so held by the early Christians.

This principle denies infant baptism. The one is antagonistic to the other. There is a regular chain of witnesses against infant baptism, from its first introduction to the present time.

Neander, says: "It cannot possibly be proved that infant baptism was practiced in the Apostolic age."

Dean Stanley, who is one of England's greatest divines, and of the very highest human authority, says: "In the Apostolic age, and in the three centuries that followed, it is evident, that those who came to baptism, came in full age, of their own deliberate choice." He says: "For the first thirteen centuries, the almost universal practice of baptism was that of which we read in the New Testament, and which is the very meaning of the word "baptize;" those who were baptized were submerged, plunged under water of their own choice." So we see, while immersion was their only mode in ancient times, it was also confined to those who believed, and came of their own accord for this rite.

The third distinguishing feature of these Christians was, baptized believers alone composed the Church. The command, "He that *believeth* and is *baptized* shall be saved," was the key note in all the churches, and we read of no others who in those days were enrolled as members. A converted church membership, as held by us now, withstood

the corruptions introduced by the Catholics, after the death of those distinguished as leaders in the second and third centuries.

Tertullian was a lawyer at Carthage. He was converted and joined the church at that city. This was a little over two hundred years after Christ. Religion became popular and many sought admission into the churches. Tertullian insisted on examining and re-baptizing those that could not make it appear that they had been baptized by churches of the same faith and order.

Origen, who as a leader appears on the stage of action in the year, A. D. 230, was a native of Alexandria, and born of Christian parents. He advocated believers' baptism essential to Church membership.

Justin, the martyr, lived in the second century and advocated these same gospel principles. "As many as are persuaded and believe that those things which are taught by us are true, and do promise to live according to them, are directed first to pray, and ask God, with fasting, the forgiveness of their sins: and we also fast and pray with them. Then we bring them to some place where there is water, and they are washed in the name of the Father, &c. After he is baptized and becomes one of us, we lead him to the congregation of the brethren, when, with great fervency, we pour out our souls together in prayer, both for ourselves and for the person baptized. . . . . Bread and a cup of wine are then brought," &c. What a similarity here shown to that of Baptist practice now! In fact, we recognize the very same principles and customs which have ever distinguished us.

So during the first three centuries, Christian congregations all over the East subsisted in separate, independent bodies, composed only of those who believed and were baptized. All this time they were Baptist churches.

Let us look at the fourth century. This was the time of the Emperor, Constantine the Great, so well related in

history. We call up a few witnesses of this period whose records have outlived the ravages of time.

Ephraim Syrus says that in his time "it was the custom, when any one was baptized, to declare that he had forsaken the devil and all his works," &c., that "the baptized first confessed their sins, and testified their faith before many witnesses."

Chrysostom, Bishop of Constantinople, who lived at this time, said: "To be baptized and plunged into water and then to emerge, or rise out of it again, is a symbol of our descent into the grave, and of our ascent out of it, and therefore Paul calls baptism a burial, when he says we are buried with him." We might add many other authorities of this age, who, fourteen hundred years ago, spoke just like our Baptist preachers do now on this subject.

We are now approaching the fifth century, but we must go back a little and see how the early Christian sects started up.

Just before Constantine, Decius sat upon the throne, and issued his edict that all persons in the empire should conform to Pagan worship. This decree rent asunder the churches, many became apostate and thousands suffered death. When peace was restored these apostates applied for re-admission into the churches.

Novatian, a Presbyter in the Church of Rome, opposed the re-admission of the apostates, and a contention arose between him and the pastor, Cornelius, who favored their reception.

Novatian separated from the Church, with many others who took sides with him, and became the head of a sect, which was known by his name for many centuries. One *Novatus*, of Carthage, coming to Rome, united with him and their combined efforts were attended with great success, and the Novatianists formed the first most powerful body of Christians who dissented from the corruptions and human traditions which had crept into the churches.

They held terms of admission with them to be "a virtuous believer, and if you will accede to our confederacy against sin, you may be admitted among us by baptism, or if any Catholic has baptized you before we will re-baptize you."—Rob's History. They were at a later period called Ana-Baptists and a succession of them, we shall prove, has continued to the present day.

"During this period, says Lardner, "the Navatian Churches were very prosperous and were planted all over the Roman Empire." But the rising power of the Catholic interest, its union with the sword, the ambitious character of its officers, the greedy spirit of its Bishops prompted them to crush everything in opposition. They, consequently, robbed the Novatianists of their Churches, and drove them into obscurity. These holy people now retired from public notice, and a succession of them will be found under another name.

We now turn our attention to Africa, for it was about this time (the 4th century) when the Novatians had spread over Italy and other provinces that one Donatus, in Africa, rose by his superior abilities and virtue, and protested against the vices which distracted the churches in that region. A controversy arose and spread over all the provinces, so that in most cities there were two bishops, one at the head of the Catholic party and the other presiding over the Donatists. These dissenters in Africa were called Donatists from the name of their reformer.

Says Gibbon: "They admitted none to fellowship without a personal profession of faith; and them they baptized. They baptized converts from paganism and re-baptized all those persons who came over to their fellowship from other communities; they were very careful to remove from their places of worship everything that bore any resemblance to worldly communities. While the Catholics under Constantine were ornamenting their sanctuaries, so as to resemble heathen temples, the Donatists cleared the walls

and floors of their houses of worship of all vestiges of the ancient superstition." Their churches amounted to four hundred.

The Donatists and Novatianists closely resembled each other in doctrine and discipline.

Says Crispin, a French historian: "These two sects held, 1st, For purity of Church members, by asserting that none ought to be admitted into the Church, but such as are visibly true believers and real saints. 2nd, For purity of Church discipline. 3rd, For the independency of each Church, and 4th, They baptized again those whose first baptism they had reason to doubt. They were consequently termed Re-Baptizers and Ana-Baptists."

Osiander says, "Our modern Ana-Baptists were the same as the Donatists of old."

Fuller, the English Church historian, asserts that the Baptists in England in his days were the Donatists new dipped.

In the year A. D., 314, Constantine witnessed the disputes between the Donatists and Catholics. The Catholics appealed to him for support. In answer he appointed commissioners to hear both sides, but failing to obtain satisfaction, the emperor condescended to hear the parties himself, but could not effect a reconciliation. The Donatists said: "What has the emperor to do with the Church? What have Christians to do with kings? or what have Bishops to do at court?" Constantine, seeing his authority questioned by these Baptists, listened to his Bishops and the advice of his court and deprived the Donatists of their churches. This so called Christian emperor went so far as to have some of these innocent people put to death, and in the decline of his life, as a good Catholic, he issued his edicts against all who dissented from the Catholic faith. Up to this time the Donatists were almost as numerous as the Catholics. Their influence must have been very considerable, since the historian, Mr. Jones, remarks that

"there was scarcely a city or town in Africa in which there was not a Donatist Church."

The difficulty of establishing infant baptism, caused Augustine to call a council at Mela, in the year 415, and issue the following manifesto to the dissenters: "That it is our will that all that affirm that young children receive everlasting life, albeit they be not by the sacrament of grace or baptism renewed, and that will not that young children, which are newly born from their mother's womb, shall be baptized to the taking away of original sin, that they be anathematized." At this council there were ninety-two ministers presided over by Augustine.

Another council of divines was convened the same year at Carthage and passed this decree: "We will that whoever denies that little children by baptism are freed from perdition and eternally saved, *that they be accursed.*" So we see that while the sword and infant baptism have ever been companions, that it took fire, sword and the dungeon to enforce its bloody edicts. Believers' baptism has never borrowed a foreign aid for its support; it originated from heaven (John I-32) and has been maintained to this day among the followers of the Lamb by the same divine teaching and sustaining power.

But to return from this digression. We come next to the sixth century. Pope Gregory is now on his throne. Every means was now used to blot out the Donatists, who still held on to their religion, "of whom the world was not worthy." Marked out for vengeance, and realizing no hope of safety, they disappeared. Many of them emigrated to Spain and Italy and hid among the mountains. From their conduct in assembling in caves and dens of mountains to worship, they obtained the name of "Montenses," or Mountaineers. In the seventh century the Donatists dwindled away into obscurity.

To contemplate the history of these people, so correct in morals, simple in worship, faithful to their Master in all

His commands, and for four hundred years "kept the faith once delivered to the saints," excites our admiration and love. Their professions and views were so allied to our own, creates a feeling of pleasure as we remember that we are their legitimate but unworthy successors.

The "Paulicians were a sect which began its wonderful career in the year A. D. 653. Its origin is thus given by the historians. In a town in Armedia there resided an obscure person by the name of Constantine, who afterwards gave himself the Scriptural name of Sylvanus. He entertained for some days, at his house, a prisoner who had been released and was returning home and stopped with him. To requite the hospitality of his host, he gave Constantine two manuscripts which he had brought out of Syria, and these proved to be the four gospels and the Epistles of the Apostle Paul. These manuscripts were highly prized by Constantine and were the means of his conversion. He at once became a teacher of the doctrines of Christ, and drew around him many who from his great zeal in strictly teaching and practicing the doctrines of St. Paul obtained the name of Paulicians. They formed a creed similar to the Donatists and Novatians who had just disappeared. They held, in their Churches, the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper to be restrictrd to believers.

They baptized and re-baptized adults by immersion.

"It is evident," says Mosheim, "that they rejected the baptism of infants."

"They were Ana-Baptists, or rejecters of infant baptism," says Dr. Alix.

"They were orthodox in the doctrine of the Trinity," says Milner.

Constantine became a preacher of great power and success in Pontus and Cappadocia. Great numbers of disciples were gathered in by him. The body of Christians in Armenia came over to the Paulicians, and embraced their views. Churches were organized in Asia Minor and in the

regions beyond the Alps. Six of their principal churches took the names of those Paul addressed his epistles to: Rome, Corinth, Ephesus, Philippi, Colosse, and Thessalonica; while the names of Sylvanus' travelling companions and fellow-laborers were called Timothy, Titus, Barnabas, and so on, and were distinguished by their Scriptural names.

In this great work of preaching and evangelizing provinces, Sylvanus spent twenty-seven years of his life and "multitudes were happily converted to God."

But their success drew upon them the most bitter persecutions by those who held different views. The political authorities were appealed to, and the Paulicians were capitally punished, and their books, wherever found, committed to the flames. Sylvanus was himself stoned to death, and many of his followers were massed together in an immense pile, and, by order of the emperor, burnt to ashes. Simeon, the executioner, afterwards became a convert from reading their books, and became the successor of Sylvanus, as a preacher, and at last sealed his testimony with his blood. A great number of them were transported into Thrace during this century. From Thrace they passed into Bulgaria and Sclavonia. They multiplied in great numbers, using the New Testament as their only rule of faith and practice. A Paulician woman recommended one Sergius to read Paul's writings, which he did, and embracing their views, for thirty-four years he devoted himself to the ministry. He preached with such fervor and eloquence, as to cause the clergy of the Catholics to declare him to be the forerunner of Anti-Christ. The more they were persecuted, the wider they spread and multiplied.

The severest persecution they suffered was encouraged by the Empress Theodora, in the year 845. After confiscating the property of one hundred thousand of these people, as many were put to death by the most cruel torture. But it was impossible to exterminate this "cloud of wit-

nesses for Jesus." "From Italy," says Mosheim, "the Paulicians sent colonies into almost all the provinces of Europe."

About the middle of the eleventh century they were found throughout France, Germany and other countries, called by different names. In Italy they were called Paterini, in France Bulgarians, but chiefly by the name of Albigenses, from the town of Alby, in which many of them lived. We are now recording events in what is called the Dark Age of the world. A Catholic writer calls it the *iron, leaden*, and *obscure* age. He says, "Christ was then, as it appears, in a very deep sleep. The Disciples were themselves fast asleep."

It may be true of the Catholics; but while this long night of silence and deep sleep, with awful darkness, brooded over every branch of that establishment, the Baptists were not asleep. It was in the tenth century that the Paulicians emigrated from Bulgaria and spread themselves in every province in Europe. Holding up the lamp in this Dark Age for others' guidance, proved to the nations sitting in darkness and death, that the "gates of hell could not prevail against the church of Christ." The same principles advocated by these very ancient Christians were the same maintained and practiced alone by the Baptists of the present day.

"They had no bishops," says the historian, Moshiem, "the candidates were prepared for baptism by instruction. They viewed baptism as having no virtue to save, and affording no benefit to children. They were agreed in regarding the Church of Rome as an apostate Church."

We have now imperfectly and briefly detailed to the end of the tenth century, an account of the only religious body of people, whom no power on earth could subvert to yield to the corruptions of the times that tried men's souls. What emotions of joy and sorrow are called forth in the study of these Christian heroes! Joy, because we have a

succession of godly men; sorrow, because their labor of love cost them such immense suffering!

In 1040 the Paterines had become very numerous and Milan was their chief headquarters.

Here they flourished at least two hundred years. They are described as being "decent in their deportment, modest in their dress and discourse, and their morals irreproachable." Their churches were divided into sixteen districts such as the Baptists call associations. The Milan association numbered 1500 members. But persecutions drove them from their churches and homes about the middle of the eleventh century and scattered them in almost all the provinces of Europe.

"These dissenting Baptists," says Mosheim, "spread like an inundation from Italy into other countries, and sent forth moral streams to prevent the world from becoming stagnant with the pollutions of the Romish Church." It was about this time, in the year 1137, that a great Reformer arose in Italy, a most powerful opponent to the Catholic church, who in fortitude and zeal was equal to Martin Luther, who succeeded him several hundred years later on, and his superior in learning and talents. This was Arnold of Brescia. By his eloquence and boldness he alarmed the Catholic officials, while he exposed their corruptions, and became the champion of religious liberty. The people flocked to hear him, and followed him as a new light in great darkness. But he was condemned to perpetual silence by the Papal authorities, and he fled from Italy into Switzerland and planted the standard of Reformation among those brave mountaineers. He soon conceived and hazarded the bold design of visiting Rome and fixing the standard of rebellion in the very heart of the capital. His popularity became so great that it caused the Pope (Eugenius III) to leave the capital. The vices of the clergy he exposed, and declared that the bishops and the Pope himself must renounce their temporal power or their salvation, quoting.

says Gibbon, the declaration of Christ, "that his kingdom was not of this world." For ten years his eloquence thundered over the Seven Hills, while two Popes, either trembled in the Vatican, or wandered as exiles in the adjacent cities.

While Arnold's friends were numerous, and his influence over the populace was powerful, the sword was no weapon in his articles of faith. The Pope placed himself at the head of his troops and at length restored his official dignity on the throne. In the year 1155 this noble man was seized, crucified and burned to death; his ashes were thrown into the river that no relic of his body might be left to his followers. Still the efforts of Arnold, in behalf of civil and religious liberty, "were cherished in the breasts of future reforming spirits, and inspired those mighty attempts in Wickliffe, Huss, Luther and others. His memory was long and fondly cherished by his countrymen and his tragical end occasioned never ceasing hostility to Catholic authority.

Now it is a well established fact in history that Arnold and his followers denied that baptism should be administered to infants, and this was one of the charges held against them. They also maintained the supremacy of the churches and of their being independent separate organizations and in all respects taught and practiced the same principles that Baptists do now.

The thirteenth century was characterized by the Catholic's hatred to these reformers, the Arnoldists and Paterines, who had increased in great numbers. A most cruel decree in the reign of Frederick was issued against them in these terms: "We will not suffer these wretches to live." "Some were to have their tongues pulled out, while others were to be committed to the flames."

Dr. Wall says of them: "They had increased to a great multitude." Their schools and churches were supported by contributions by churches of the same faith in Bohemia

and Poland. They owned the Scriptures as a rule of conduct and administered the ordinance of Baptism to *believers* by one immersion. They were always found on the side of religious liberty.

There were also reformers in France, at the same time, and even earlier than those above described. Bruno and Berenger, were most prominent leaders. It is said that Berenger, by his discourses charmed the people and vast numbers followed him. His doctrines and teachings spread through France, Italy, Germany and other kingdoms. The Catholic's were alarmed at their success.

The Bishop of Leige, said in his charge against them that "they maintained the host is not the Lord's body, and as far as in them lies, *overthrow the baptism of infants.*"

Their followers were so numerous, that old historians relate that France, Italy, Germany, England and other countries were infected with their principles. The Berengarians were of the same stamp with the Paterines and Albigenses, as well as the Waldenses.

The historian Morrell declares that "at one time, above eight hundred thousand persons professed the Berengarian faith."

The name of another great reformer in France, was Peter de Bruys, who lived at the same age with Arnold, of Italy, holding similar religious sentiments. Their principles handed down to us by historians are these: "The ordinance of baptism must be administered only to adults; that in the Lord's Supper, the real body and blood of Christ were not partaken by the communicants, but only represented in the way of symbol or figure; that baptism was useless to children who wanted the exercise of reason." Peter de Bruys, preached for twenty years these glorious doctrines, when the Catholics through fear of this intrepid Reformer, committed his body to the flames at St. Giles, a city of France.

Five years after the martyrdom of Peter de Bruys, Henry of Toulouse, one of his disciples, carried on the reformation with wonderful success. He travelled through many provinces, preaching the pure word of God with great zeal and eloquence. Dr. Wall, the Pedo-Baptist historian, calls Henry and Peter "two Anti-Pædo-Baptist ministers." "The followers of Henry were called Henricians, and the Albigenses were their successors in faith and doctrine," says Bernard. In the face of all the opposing powers, like the Paulicians, they went forth in this dark period of the world, armed with the precepts and promises of the New Testament, with a simple and humble reliance on the Spirit of Truth for guidance and support. The censures of men, the bulls of Popes, and the decrees and anathemas of councils could not force them to yield the laws of Christ to the "commandments of men."

About this time another witness for truth appeared upon the stage in the person of one Peter Waldo, a rich merchant of Lyons. He was engaged in translating the four gospels into French from Latin. He found that the religion and practice of the Roman church were so different from the doctrines and practices of Christ and His Apostles, he at once abandoned his vocation as merchant, divided his goods among the poor, and joined these pious saints in the simple and true worship of God. He maintained at his own expense several persons, whom he employed to expound the translations of the Scriptures which he had made to the people. His followers, like himself, renounced all worldly property, and the poor and rich had all things in common. From this circumstance, their enemies called them "the poor of Lyons," and from the city in which Waldo began his labors, they were termed "Lionists;" but from the similarity of sentiment they were afterwards called Waldenses. The Albigenses whose religious views had been a considerable time established gave their entire support to Waldo as soon as he appeared in public.

Dissenters were called by various names, as Donatists, Paulicians, Arnoldists, the poor of Lyons, or Lionists, Paterines, Albigenses, Waldenses, &c., &c., expressive of one and the same class of Christians.

In the year A. D., 1177, Waldo was forced to leave France and fled into Germany with a multitude of his followers, carrying the glad tidings of salvation. Lucius III issued his decree against them, saying: "We declare these sects to lie under a perpetual curse for teaching Baptism and the Lord's Supper otherwise than the Church of Rome."

Their houses were destroyed and they sought shelter in the valleys of the Piedmont taking with them the new translation of the Bible. "Their doctrines were disseminated into Flanders, Poland, Spain, Calabria, and even into the dominions of the Grand Sultan." Consequently Waldo and his followers, had in a few years, drawn great numbers from the corrupt Church, and their doctrines "made a great noise in the world." The Pope sent his Cardinal and Bishops among them and required them to subscribe to his articles, one of which reads thus: "We believe that none are saved except they are baptized, and that children are saved by baptism," &c.

Refusing to accept these terms, many were burnt and others banished.

"Here is the patience of the saints; here are they that keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus."—Rev. 14–12.

The appalling scenes that follow in the next century (the thirteenth) make the pages of history blush to record the acts of men claiming to be Christians. The Pope, Innocent III, having failed to put down those heretics, instituted "The Army of the Crusaders." It is said an army of five hundred thousand men was put in motion, destined to destroy these innocent Baptists. The cruelties of these crusaders seem to have no parallel in history. In a

few months two hundred thousand lives were sacrificed upon the altar of religious freedom. Large cities were reduced to ashes, and thousands driven from their burning homes to wander in the woods and mountains, and perish with hunger.

Simon de Montford, an Englishman, and Earl of Leicester, was their leader in the first crusade. His wife, Alice, raised a second army the next spring, and if possible, became more cruel. Some were hung on gibbets. One hundred of the inhabitants of the city Brom, had their noses cut off and their eyes plucked out, and were then sent, under the guidance of a man with one eye spared, to inform the citizents of other towns what fate awaited them.

On the 22nd of July, A. D. 1210, the crusaders took possession of the town of Minerva. The Albigensian Christians were then assembled, the men in one house and the women in another, and there on their knees awaited their fate. A Catholic priest preached to them to repent. But they with one voice cried: "We have renounced the Church of Rome; we will have none of your faith; your labor is in vain, for neither death nor life will make us renounce the opinions that we have embraced." An enormous pile of dry wood was prepared, and the Abbot thus addressed these humble followers of Christ: "Be converted to the Catholic faith, or ascend this pile;" but none of them were shaken. The wood was set on fire, and over 150 innocent victims perished in the flames, commending their souls to God. The sacrifice of human life during this crusade cannot be computed. These armies of the crusaders continued for eight successive years, and the Albigensian Church was drowned in blood. No calculations can ascertain the amount of wealth dissipated or the destruction of human life which resulted from these crusades. The Albigensian Church was now drowned in blood.

"The slaughter," says Mr. Jones, "had been so prodigious, the massacres so universal, the terror so profound

and of so long duration that the Church of Rome appeared completely to have attained their object." Says Gibbon: "The visible assemblies of the Paulicians or Albigenses were extirpated by fire and sword; and the bleeding remnant escaped by flight, but the invincible spirit which they had kindled still lived and breathed in the Western world."

In the year 1373 that celebrated Reformer, John Huss, was born. He was educated in the University of Prague. In 1404 he embraced the sentiments of the Waldenses and became their leader. He was a man of great eloquence and power. He joined issue with the Pope and for a time led his followers to success in reform. But being shamefully betrayed he was tried for heresy, convicted and burnt. He sustained his sentence with the most heroic fortitude and died praying for his enemies.

Jerome, of Prague, of whom so much has been written, was Huss' most intimate companion. He was a man of great learning and traveled throughout Europe, where he was greatly admired for his graceful eloquence, and preached with great effect against the abominations of the times, which caused him to be arrested and brought before Constance on the 17th of April, 1415, and sentenced to death. He expired in the flames singing, "*Hanc animam in flammies, offero, Christe, tibi,*"—"This soul of mine, in flames of fire, O, Christ, I offer Thee." His defence before the Pope is described by the Pope's secretary in a letter to a friend, "as noble in bearing and with great eloquence of language which excited the admiration of his enemies." He first began with prayer to God, whose assistance he pathetically implored. He then referred to profane history and to unjust sentences given against Socrates, Plato, Anaxagoras, and others. He referred to examples in the Scriptures and such was the force of his appeal that his hearers were greatly affected, and shook the credit of the witnesses. "It was," says the secretary, "impossible to hear this pathetic speaker without emotion. In his defence his voice was sweet, dis-

tinct and full; his action every way the most proper, either to express indignation or to raise pity, though he made no affected application to the passions of his audience. Firm and intrepid he stood before the council, collected in himself, and not only contemning, but seeming even desirous of death."

Thus on the 20th day of May, A. D. 1416, another martyr as a witness for Jesus, and defender of the faith cheerfully met his fate in a most horrible form, and that, too, at the hands of those claiming to be Christians, and because he taught and practiced the doctrines of the Ana-Baptists, and principally for denying infant baptism. The Baptists from the time of their early settlement lived about the forests and mines of Germany, and accessions were multiplied from other kingdoms and by those converted under Huss and Jerome. The proceedings of the Council of Constance and the news of the fate of these great men flew like lightning all over the kingdom and Bohemia was all in an uproar. A conflict now commenced between the Hussites and Catholics and a state of civil discord lasted twelve years, during which time thousands of innocent people lost their lives. The history of the struggles for religious liberty continued by our ancestors against the Catholics with varied success and suffering on up to the seventeenth century, but we have not time here to detail to the reader the wonderful energy and pluck manifested by them "to keep the ordinances once delivered to the saints."

Robinson, in his Church History, asserts that "Greece was the parent of the Vaudois, while Piedmont was the jailer." While other kingdoms and provinces barbarously used all dissenters, the valleys of Piedmont for ages afforded them an asylum, such as "kept the word of my patience." —Rev. 3-10. Blessed here with security and liberty and free from the impurities of the harlot, their minds with no human forms, their knees bowed to no delegated authority, their devotion was guided by no adjusted rules; their

lips made no professions but such as were stimulated by choice, and that choice was the response of divine benevolence, aided by a glowing gratitude to the Lamb. Such were Novatian and Novatus, with Constantine, Sylvanus and Surgius of the preceeding centuries, with their great and distinguished brethren, Arnold, Waldo, Berengarius, Henry and Peter de Bruys, alluded to in these pages heretofore. "They had the Old and New Testament," says an inquisitor, "in the vulgar tongue; and they teach and learn so well, that he had seen and heard a poor countryman repeat all the book of Job, word for word, by heart." He says, "There was scarcely a man or woman among them, who was not far better read in the Bible than the doctors of the Church." A distinguished writer of the fifteenth century affirms that this description of the Waldenses was a true picture of the heretics of his age, particularly of the Ana-Baptists.

The centuriators of Magdeburg, under the twelfth century, recite from an old manuscript the outlines of the Waldensian creed, viz: "In articles of faith, the authority of the Holy Scriptures is the highest authority, and for that reason it is the standard of judging, so that whatever doth not agree with the word of God is to be rejected. The sacraments of the Church of Christ are two, baptism and the Lord's Supper." "Their numbers," says Mosheim, "became so formidable as to menace the Papal jurisdiction with a fatal overthrow, and were only checked by the crusading armies." They numbered about this time eight hundred thousand persons. For one hundred and thirty years after the destruction of their churches in France, the Waldenses in these valleys had respite from the severity of a general persecution, all of which time they multiplied greatly; "they took deep root, they filled the land, they covered the hills with their shadows, and sent out their boughs unto the sea, and their branches unto the river." But still they occasionally suffered great outrages by Catholic hatred.

It is related that in one of these valleys in the month of December, 1400, when the mountains were covered with snow, the Catholics attacked these peaceable inhabitants without warning and caused them to flee to one of the highest mountains of the Alps with their wives and children; the unhappy mothers carrying the cradle in one hand, and with the other leading such of the offspring as were able to walk. Their inhuman invaders pursued them in their flight until darkness obscured the objects of their fury. Many were slain before they reached the mountains. Overtaken by the darkness of the night, these poor and persecuted people wandered up and down the mountains covered with snow, destitute of shelter, benumbed with cold; some fell asleep and became an easy prey to the severity of the climate, and when night had passed away there were found in their cradles, or lying upon the snow hundreds of their infants deprived of life; many of their mothers were dead by their side and others on the point of expiring. So revolting and inhuman a scene was the subject of recital for a century afterwards by the descendants of these true Christian people.

In the beginning of the sixteenth century, things were more quiet. A monk was deputed to hold a conference with the Waldenses, to convince them of their errors, but the monk returned in confusion, saying that in his whole life he had never known so much of the Scriptures as he had learned while conversing with the heretics. Others visited them and returned with similar convictions.

Louis XII, king of France, deputed two of his noblemen, in the year 1498, to investigate and report on accusations brought against these people. On their return to court, they said, "Their places of worship were free from those ornaments found in Catholic churches. We discovered no crimes, they keep the Sabbath day, observe the ordinance of baptism according to the *primitive Church,* (not as the Catholic Church,) instruct their children in the ar-

ticles of Christian faith and the commandments of God." "So effectual was their mode of instruction that many of them could retain in their memories most of the New Testament."

What a lesson is here taught us of the ninteenth century, and it makes us blush for shame when we see how we fall below the zeal and piety of these Christians of four hundred years ago!

But we have now arrived, in these brief and desultory sketches, at that period when the great Reformer Martin Luther, appears on the scene of action. He comes at an age when the whole religious world is more quiet. The Pope is on his throne and wields the power over Church and State. The heretics, our Waldensian brethren, and Ana-Baptists have been put to flight and are now found scattered over Italy, France, Germany, Switzerland and in fact nearly all Europe, but through fear of persecution, concealed their faith as best they could. It was a source of infinite satisfaction to them when they learned that Luther and his adherents, by their boldness and daring, had set the Catholic Church at defiance; and in the year 1526 they deputed some of their brethren to visit and inquire into the truth. "It was found," says Mezeray, "that the Waldenses in their conferences with Luther, were not in unison with him on the ordinances, but sufficient in faith to unite with him in opposition to their old enemy." Calvin, who began in 1534 to preach the reforming doctrines, was found in his views more in accordance with the sentiments of the Ana-Baptists than Luther, consequently they were more disposed to encourage Calvin.

Notwithstanding the consternation thrown into the ranks of the Pope by Luther, aided by Calvin, these long persecuted people still to a great extent maintained their ancient faith, and finally drew upon them the wrath of these two great religious reformers. In order to illustrate how well these people instructed their children in the Scriptures, the

historian McRie, tells us that "a monk, preaching one day in the town of Imola, told the people that it behooved them to purchase heaven by the merit of their good works. A boy who was present, exclaimed, 'That's blasphemy, for the Bible tells us that Christ purchased heaven by his sufferings and death, and bestows it on us freely by his mercy.' A dispute now arose between the preacher and the boy. Provoked at the pertinent replies of his juvenile opponent and at the favorable reception which the audience gave him, 'Get you gone, you young rascal,' exclaimed the monk; 'you are just come from the cradle and will you take it upon you to judge of sacred things which the most learned cannot explain?' 'Did you never read these words,' 'out of the mouths of babes and sucklings God perfects praise?' rejoined the youth, upon which the preacher left the pulpit in wrathful confusion, breathing out threatenings against the poor boy, and had him thrown into prison."

Bishop Bossuet, says: "You call Claude of Turin one of your apostolical Church; you adopt Henry and Peter de Bruys, yet these, every one knows, were Ana-Baptists." They were called by various names in different ages, but all agreed in one article of discipline—they re-baptized all such as came into their communion from the Catholic Church, hence were called Ana-Baptists."

In 1665 the Waldenses were called to endure sufferings of the most serious character, which awakened all the Protestant princes of Europe; and Oliver Cromwell, on hearing of their persecution, rose like a lion from his lair, and deputed Sir Samuel Moreland to intercede with their oppressors and relieve their distresses.

In 1685, October 8th, the edict of Nantz was repealed, by which act no toleration could be allowed to dissenters from Catholic faith. Fifteen days were allowed them to leave the kingdom; two millions of persons were condemned by this instrument and banished from their native soil.

These were the glorious days of Baptists in France; these were her proudest triumphs; she could then boast of valor of which the world was not worthy; her martyrs then bore testimony to their faith at the fatal tree, or were chained to the oar of the galleys for life; and women shrank not from perpetual prison in the gloomy tower that overhung the Mediterranean.

Jacob Merning, in his history of these times, states that he had in his possession, "a confession of faith of the Baptists, called Waldenses, written in the German tongue; which declared the absence of infant baptism, and that their forefathers practiced no such thing, and they were spread through Poland, Lombardy, Germany and Holland. Amid all the sectaries of religion and teachers of the gospel in Germany at this time the Baptists best understood the doctrine of religious liberty, and under whatever government they were always found on the side of liberty."

From these and following historical facts it will be seen "that the Baptists has been the only community of Christians which has stood since the Apostles, and which has preserved pure the doctrines of the gospel through all ages." The threatening aspect of affairs in Germany suggested the necessity of emigrating, and Mosheim asserts "that the German Baptists passed in shoals into Holland and the Netherlands, and in the course of time amalgamated with the Dutch Baptists."

Says the same writer: "The drooping spirits of this people, who had been dispersed through many countries and persecuted every where with the greatest severity, were revived when they heard that Luther had attempted the Reformation." Seeing the attempts of Luther they hoped the happy period was arrived in which the restoration of Rome to purity was to be accomplished, under the divine protection, by the labors and counsels of pious and eminent men. Luther had boldly stepped forward and set tyranny at defiance. To further the great work, he publish-

ed the New Testatment in German, wrote letters to the sovereigns of Europe, broke with the Pope, and pushed forward the work of the Reformation. The Pope denounced Luther, and he nobly, on December 10th, 1520, had a pile of wood erected without the walls of Wittenburgh, and there in the presence of a large multitude of people of all ranks, committed to the flames, both the bull that had been published against him, and the canons relating to the Pope's jurisdiction. The boldness of this and other acts caused Luther to be called to Worms, by Charles V, where he nobly and boldly pleaded his cause. While shut up in the castle at Wurtenberg he translated the whole of the New Testament, using this language in Matthew the 3rd chapter and 1st verse: "In those days came *John the dipper.*" So that Luther is charged by the Catholics with being the author of the German dippers. At this period the reformers took the Scriptures as their only guide in faith and practice. Luther declares that "it could not be proved by the Scriptures that infant baptism was instituted by Christ, or began by the first Christians after the Apostles." What a pity he did not adhere to these truths! For, as we will see, he afterwards abandoned his true and noble standpoint, and became a cruel persecutor of his Baptist supporters. He was such an admirer of Muncer, that learned and pious Baptist minister, as to call him his Absalom. But he could not bear the idea of others leading in the Reformation. When he heard of the popularity of his old friends, Carolstadt, and Muncer, of their winning the hearts of the people, and re-baptizing many who came over to them, he, in March 1522, broke his confinement at the hazard of his life, and flew back to Wittenberg, when he disowned them as fellow-laborers, and would only receive Melancthon. "The success of the Baptists now exasperated him to the last degree; and he became their enemy, notwithstanding all he had said in favor of dipping, and persecuted them under the name of

re-dippers, re-baptizers, or Ana-Baptists. He fell out with Carolstadt, he disliked Calvin and found fault with Zwinglius. He was angry beyond meaure with Muncer and the Baptists. The violence of Luther sunk his cause into that of party. He would not have a competitor. Of all the teachers of religion in Germany at this time, the Baptists best understood the doctrine of civil and religious liberty: to them, therefore, the oppressed looked for counsel. The tyranny of the Catholics and Lutherans excited them with great fear.

Thomas Muncer had been a Roman priest, but became a disciple of Luther and a favorite with the people. He was so much loved by Luther as to call him his Absalom, as before stated, and the people called him Luther's curate. When he saw with astonishment and pain the tyranny of his leader he remonstrated with him, and caused Luther to banish him. He now travelled into various parts, preaching soul liberty to the people. He exposed the errors of Catholicism, opposed the extreme measures of Luther, and declared that a Christian church ought to consist of pious individuals, who professed faith in Christ and not as Luther taught, "to include whole parishes." Upon these principles he formed a church at the town of Mulhausen, where multitudes came to be instructed and comforted by him about the year 1523.

Voltaire, that great infidel and learned man of France, said of Luther and Muncer: "Luther had been successful in stirring up the princes, nobles and magistrates of Germany against the Pope and Bishops; Muncer stirred up the peasants against them." He said that "Muncer laid open that dangerous truth, which is implanted in every breast, that all men are born equal," saying, "that if the Popes had not treated the princes like their subjects, the princes had not treated the common people like beasts." What Luther had censured about the Pope's usurpation, he now practiced himself towards these good men.

He wrote to the magistrates of Mulhausen, on hearing of Muncer's success, and advised them to require of him to give an account of his call to the ministry, and if he could not prove that he acted under human authority, then to insist on his proving his call from God by working a miracle!

The people resented this insult by expelling from the city Luther's monkish allies, and elected Muncer as one of their Senators.

Luther and his colleagues had now to dispute their way with hosts of Baptists all over Germany, Saxony, Switzerland and other countries for several years. At Zurich the Senate warned the people to desist from re-baptizing, but all their warnings were in vain. Recourse to the sword was resorted to to check the increase of the Baptists. An edict against Ana-baptism was published in 1522, in which there was a penalty of a silver mark set upon all such as should suffer themselves re-baptized, or should withhold baptism from their children. Not succeeding in this, severer measures were decreed against them, and many Baptists were drowned and burnt. Such were some of the acts of this great Reformer.

The Emperor, Frederic, the friend of Luther, was appealed to to put down these heretics, so alarming had they become in number, which caused them to assemble in different provinces to the number of three hundred thousand men, to provide means of redress. The doctrine of liberty so strongly advocated by the Baptists naturally attracted their minds towards Muncer, their leader, who drew up a memorial expressive of their grievances, and which was presented to their Lords, and dispersed all over Germany. It consists of twelve articles, on civil and religious liberty. It is said to be a master production of the kind, and Voltaire says: "A Lycurgus would have signed it." A similar spirit prevailed among the Baptists of Virginia and the other colonies, prior to the Revolution, and their principles

suggested to Thomas Jefferson the basis of our national Constitution.

But to continue. These oppressed men were consequently met by their lords with a sword, instead of redress. Thousands were slaughtered and the great and good Muncer was put to death. Had Muncer been successful in procuring liberty for the German peasants, ten thousand tongues would have celebrated his praise in different ages. The very historians who censure him would have vied to crown his memory with unfading honors. All this occurred ten years before the miserable affair of Munster, of which the Ana-Baptists have been so much accused in history.

We trust we have not wearied the reader with these sad details of truthful history, and to go a little further; it is just to state here how the Munster affair was brought about, in defence of the Ana-Baptists who have had the blame to bear.

The city of Munster is in Westphalia, where the tumult and disorder occurred in 1532. A Pedo-Baptist minister of the Lutheran persuasion, by the name of Ratman, assisted by other ministers of the Reformation, began the disturbance in opposing the Papists. It was about the Protestant religion, and the fight had begun before any Ana-Baptist came. The fanatics held the city and kept it in a most disorderly manner, until in 1535, the Bishop of Munster, assisted by the princes, besieged the city and the fanatics were taken and put to death in the most terrible and ignominious manner. This disorderly and outrageous conduct of a handful of Ana-Baptists, with others, drew upon their whole body a stigma and reproach of which, as a body, they are innocent. We mention this by way of defence of the underserved calumny brought against these long persecuted people, who were not at all the authors or instigators of the Munster rebellion.

Because Ana-Baptists were involved with the fanatics at Munster, in their zeal for liberty, Pedo-Baptists dwell on

the plenitude of the sin, to divert the mind from the originators of the affray, and by blackening the Baptists, they leave a happy comparison for the excesses of their favorites. Had no Baptists been mixed up in this affair, no such people would have been allowed to exist at the time; for it is claimed even now by some of their writers that the Baptists began with Roger Williams, who was not born till ages afterwards.

Now Cardinal Hossius, who was chairman at the Council of Trent and whose acquaintance with ancient history is undisputable, says of these people: "If the truth of religion were to be judged of by the readiness and cheerfulness which a man of any sect shows in suffering, then the opinions and persuasions of no sect can be truer or surer than those of the Ana-Baptists, since there have been none for these twelve hundred years past, that have been more grievously punished." (This one sentence carries us back as a denomination to the year 340, and admitted by this learned and honest historian.)

We cannot close this brief sketch of the *rise and progress of the Baptists*, without alluding to one more of our ancient brethren so distinguished in the Church history. The beloved and eloquent Menno Simon was born in the year 1496, at Witmarsum, in Friesland. He was a Roman priest, but had little knowledge of the Bible. For a time, he disdained to examine the Testament, but becoming to some extent alarmed about his situation, he was induced to read the Scriptures, and while reading, he was also attracted to the writings of Luther, and became convinced of the errors of Popery. Among the thousands that suffered death for Ana-Baptism, was one Snyden, who was beheaded. The constancy of this man to his views of a believer's baptism, preferring death to renouncing his sentiments, led Menno to inquire into the subject of baptism. As he could not find infant baptism in the Bible, he consulted a minister of that persuasion, and was told that it had no

foundation in the Bible. He continued his researches till he became confirmed that the Baptists were right. In studying the word of God, he was deeply convicted of sin and converted to the truth. He was baptized by immersion, declaring that "he could not find any other baptism than dipping in water, which was acceptable to God." He devoted himself with great zeal and power in preaching and writing, gathering and baptizing great numbers.

Menno's success as a preacher excited the envy and displeasure of the State parties, and in 1543 the Emperor offered a reward for his arrest. But an interposing Providence opened a way for his escape. He fled into distant provinces, founded churches, supplied them with pastors, and established a printing press to defend the denomination against the reproaches of its enemies. His followers were called Mennonites, and multiplied greatly. He continued his labors with wonderful success for twenty-five years, preaching in England, and in other portions of Europe, to thousands "who received him gladly." He was said to be a man of persuasive eloquence and captivated his hearers everywhere he went. He was a shining mark of his day, and though the arrows of death were aimed at his noble breast, he evaded them all and died the Christian's peaceful death and in the triumphs of faith, Jan. 15, 1561. In him the Baptists had a leader worthy of their cause, while his deeds of love remain embalmed in their memories to this day.

Taking a retrospective view in concluding these sketches, enough has been shown, that from the time of Pope Slyvester, (during the reign of Constantine, when he united the spiritual with the temporal power,) to prove the existence of a body of religious men, who ever opposed such a union, and vigorously maintained freedom of conscience and the entire *separation of Church and State*.

Neander, the great Church historian, considers this the true historical origin of the sect of the Waldenses and Don-

atists, who from this time, A. D. 330, with their successors, ever opposed the union and held that "Christ in dying for men, has given Christians the example *to die*, but *not to kill*."

Even since the Reformation, there is not a confession of faith by any of the reformers which does not give to the magistrate a coercive power in religion. Luther, as to the Jews, "thought their Synagogues should be leveled with the ground, their houses burnt, and their books taken from them." Many of the Ana-Baptists were also put to death by the Lutherans. Nor can Calvin be acquitted of the death of Servetus. Melancthon, Bucer, and many other of the reformers favored his execution. In England the same spirit prevailed. Henry VIII, burned Papists and Baptists at the same stake, and Cranmer's hands were stained with the blood of pious women, while Queen Elizabeth, re-lighted the fires of Smithfield, like her father, to burn the Ana-Baptists and Catholics. King James, resolved to break the spirit of the Non-Conformists, if it would not bow.

Nor did the Presbyterians, when they obtained the power, neglect using the authority of the State to prosecute. In Scotland, they forbade "all printers in the kingdom from printing any confession of faith without warrant signed by the clerk of the assembly." In 1642, they ordered Roman Catholics to renounce their obstinacy, under penalty of punishment and imprisonment. Down to the period of the Revolution all the colonies, except Rhode Island and Pennsylvania, had more or less an established Church, and therefore religious persecution.

In New England the Congregationalists opposed liberty of conscience and bitterly persecuted the Quakers and Baptists.

The Episcopalians collected their tithes by law in England, and their tobacco tax in America and conferred no offices of State but upon their own members. As late as

1768 and 1770 the land of the Baptists in Massachusetts was sold to support the Episcopal clergy.

The Methodists, too, at one time, joined with the Episcopalians in favor of the support of religion by the State.

Of the millions of all denominations in this country, who now enjoy the inestimable blessing of religious liberty and of all those in Europe and the world, who are now advocating it in various degrees, few are aware how much they are indebted for these enjoyments to the Baptists. "The voice of public opinion is now heard and feared on these subjects by all the spiritual tyrants of Europe.

Spain and Italy, the home of the Pope, have been compelled to abandon the horrors of the inquisition.

The King of Prussia has set his seal against intolerance and any established Church."

France affords religious protection to all.

The Mohammedan empire has sheathed her bloody sword. In Burmah, where Judson, thirty or forty years ago, was persecuted, the Baptists preach unmolested.

China, with her four hundred millions, so long shut up in idolatry, no longer opposes the introduction of the true gospel. Who can contemplate this wonderful and blessed change of affairs without the warmest emotions? The Baptists, guided by HIM, "who doeth all things well," after these long ages of persecution and suffering, rejoice with their brethren of all denominations who have united at last with them in establishing religious and civil liberty throughout all the nations of the earth, and erecting the banner of Jesus in evangelizing the world.

We have thus endeavored, though in a feeble and brief manner, to trace the *footsteps of the Baptists* from the days of the Apostles down to the seventeeth century. If we have done no more than to excite a desire in the mind of the reader of these pages, to peruse for himself the history of his fathers, to see what a chain of testimony stretches along through centuries past, of their lives, of

their suffering and labors, hand down to us the pure to gospel of Christ, and the "ordinances once delivered to the saints," we are fully repaid for our work of love. We think we have shown that the great Baptist family now spread over nearly every country of the globe, have never ceased to exist, if not in name, yet in faith and practice, since our Savior proclaimed his great commission to his Disciples. It has afforded us mixed emotions in our researches for truth. The witnesses we have referred to, their spotless lives, their steadfastness to the laws of the Redeemer, their self-denial, their perseverance through suffering, darkness and death, amid vice, wickedness and persecution, through successive ages, have raised our admiration and gratitude above our griefs, and our mental pleasures.

OUTLINES OF HISTORY

OF THE

BRIER CREEK ASSOCIATION

—o—

This Association was organized November 23rd, 1822, at Brier Creek Church, in Wilkes county. The following are the names of the delegates who composed the convention, viz: From Brier Creek Church, Thomas Masten, William Gilliam, William King, John Martin and James Martin; Bethel, William Dodson, Sr., Wm. Dodson, Jr., and George Gilreath; Fishing Creek, Jesse Adams, Joshua Johnston and W. W. Wright; Little River, John Swaim, James Robinett and Archibald Brown; Mitchell's River, Stephen Potter, John Marsh and Gideon Potter; Snow Creek, John Angel; Roaring River, Thos. Douglas and Elisha Richardson; Zion Hill, Wm. Mitchell and Jonathan Woody; Cool Spring, Ambrose Johnson and David Jacks. The above named Churches at that time formed a portion of the Yadkin Association. Rev. Thos. Masten was elected moderator and Col. James Martin, clerk. The committee on Rules and Decorum, were Thomas Wright, William King and William Dodson, Sr. The committee's report on Articles of Faith and Rules of Decorum was adopted, the same being substantially those held by this body at the present time. This committee was composed of able and judicious men. Thomas Wright represented his county (Surry) for

nearly twenty years, and most of the time in the Senate of the Legislature.

The Brier Creek Association never failed to meet in annual session for 66 years, and once in 1834 it met semi-annually, and during this long period it has persistently held and practiced the principles of our fathers of past centuries. Although its members were generally uneducated, the records show a remarkable disposition among them to stick to the old landmarks of our fathers and the doctrines taught by the Apostles. Many of its members wielded a great influence for good in State and Church, and preached the gospel with power and effect. Thousands were converted and added to the churches under their ministry. At their annual meetings thousands came from long distances to hear the word, which resulted in the conversion of vast numbers. It appears from reading the old records, that much more interest was manifested in their annual gatherings in regard to preaching and prayer, than those of more modern times. Most of the time was spent in efforts for the unconverted, and in fact little else was done. A regular correspondence was kept up with sister Associations, and the visits made from one to the other were received with gladness and much good feeling. From the time the Association was organized in 1822 up to 1838, perfect harmony existed between the different bodies, in faith and doctrine. During this period there seems to be no account of the appointment of committees to report on benevolent objects, or discussions, on education, Sabbath schools, missions, or temperance, or contributions for any object, except to defray the printing of the minutes, and occasionally small sums given to ministers who came as visitors from a distance. And yet they seemed to have had as much real enjoyment of religion, or more, than people now a days. Such earnest and devoted preachers as Smith Furgeson, Thomas Douglas, John Angel, (who served eight years a soldier in the Revolutionary war) S. D.

Swaim, Jesse Adams, Richard Jacks, Wm. Goforth, William Richards, Peter Owen, S. P. Smith, Z. B. Adams and his brother, W. F. Adams, Wm. Garner, and many others, who spent long and useful lives in the ministry, have passed over the river to receive their reward.

Along about the year 1838, the agitation on the subject of home and foreign missions began, at first among some of the Churches, and afterwards was taken up by the Associations. The Mountain, the Three Fork, Lewis Fork and Mayo, so long in harmony with the Brier Creek Association became offended with her for advocating the objects of the Baptist State Convention and withdrew their fellowship. The following extract of a letter from the Mountain Association, will serve to illustrate the commencement of hostilities against the position taken by the Brier Creek at this date.

"North Carolina, Ashe County, September 1st, 1838.

The Mountain Association to her Sister the Brier Creek:

Very Dear Brethren:—Feeling desirous to keep up a correspondence with you, we submit to you the conditions that we are willing still to correspond with you. That is, we have dropped a correspondence with all Associations, and agree to revive it on the following terms, viz: To advise the Churches to deal with any member of their body who may join any of the institutions of the day," &c.

(Signed.) Tobias Long, Moderator.

R. Gentry, Clerk.

On motion the above proposed correspondence was unanimously rejected. Some of the Churches in the Brier Creek were much divided on the subject and for a time rent asunder. While steadfastly holding on to the ancient landmarks, and the cardinal principles of the New Testament, not till the year A. D., 1850, 28 years of its existence, did the Association go into active work respecting the object of contention among other Associations and some of her

own members. It was during this year that that noble Christian man, Rev. J. J. James, at that time the editor of the *Biblical Recorder*, and who is still living, visited the body in the interests of general education and Missions. He was heartily received by the Association and preached with great ability. We find by reference to the minutes of that year, that Elder S. P. Smith and James Parks were appointed a committee to write a short report on Home Missions, and elders Z. B. Adams and J. B. Green to write on Foreign Missions, and Elder W. F. Adams and Brother David Edwards to write a report on the propriety of Sabbath Schools. Elder James got in a resolution "to establish a Female Academy." Thus the work of education and missions began, and the next year (1851) we find admirable resolutions on "Missions and Sabbath Schools." Thus after a period of thirty years from the organization of the Association, the objects of which have called forth so much spirited and useful discussion, appear for the first time on the records. In the year 1831, Dr. Samuel Wait, the founder and president of Wake Forest College, was traveling through the State in the cause of education and visited the Association, then in session at Bethel church. We have heard him speak of this visit and the difficulties he encountered on account of his advocating home and foreign missions. The Association at Bethel permitted him to preach on Sunday and just before it adjourned the following resolution was introduced by the clerk and adopted: "*Resolved*, that this Association feel friendly disposed towards the efforts making by the Baptist State Convention of North Carolina for the more general spread of the gospel and for the improvement of the ministry." Adjourned.

THOMAS DOUGLAS, Moderator.

JAMES MARTIN, Clerk.

This was in 1831. There seems to be no further action taken on the subject till the year 1850, as we have before stated, a period of nearly 20 years. The denomination

had no religious newspaper in the State, in fact, none of the other denominations had any up to this time. The Baptist State Convention came into existence in 1830, and at once began its great work, to get the churches and Associations to unite their efforts for the spread of the Gospel, and encourage education. So the Baptists, who have often been stigmatized by our brethren of other denominations as an "ignorant set," were the first in the State to utilize the power of the press; Thomas Meredith having established the *Biblical Recorder* in 1832, years before any other religious journal was published in the State. So Wake Forest College was the first denominational college in the State, beginning operations in 1833, and is still the leading institution and the best endowed and equipped in the State. The Brier Creek was one of the original fourteen Associations to aid in these useful and indispensable enterprises, and among the earliest representatives with her sons in the college. But still, as a general thing, the masses were slow to seize on to anything new, and moved with great caution. Doctor Wait stated to us that he found these Baptists of the mountains immvoable as the rocks in the fundamental doctrines of the Bible, although they looked upon him at first with suspicion, and that he had sometimes to spread down his blanket under the trees by the roadside to repose at night, rather than impose himself upon their hospitality; and yet when they fully understood his mission among them he was always a welcome guest. The strong native talent of the preachers and their zeal, excited his admiration and won his affections, although they then differed with him on the subject of missions.

In the year 1834, the Association was visited by the lamented Rev. N. A. Purefoy, as agent of the State convention, and after a sermon by him on Sunday, a collection was taken up amounting to $16.51, for the objects of the convention, so feeble was the interest felt at this time.

That talented preacher, John Culpepper, was in the Association in 1836, and the eloquent William Hill Jordan, in 1847, and created much enthusiasm by their irresistible power and influence in the cause of religion. In 1851 Rev. S. P. Smith rode as missionary in the bounds of the Association and was supported by liberal contributions. In 1852, there was much dissension among some of the churches regarding the order of the Sons of Temperance, and many were excluded from the Church for joining that society, the objection being mainly on account of its being a secret society. This agitation was kept up for a time with much bitterness, and gave rise to the Taylorsville Association (now the Brushy Mountain) which adopted *temperance* as one of its cardinal features. After a few years this contention was reconciled and harmony restored. The opposition to the various benevolent institutions in the Brier Creek, and in most of the others, died away, and from year to year, as these subjects are discussed with increased interest, it seems strange to us of this age that there ever could have been any such feeling of opposition among these noble followers of Christ.

For many years it was the custom of the Brier Creek Association to appoint some one of its members to write what they called a circular letter every year to be read before the body, on some doctrinal subject, and printed in their minutes. Some of these letters would do credit to our ablest divines and are worthy of a wider circulation. For instance, the one written by the Rev. S. P. Smith, in 1847, in which the question, "What is a Church?" is clearly stated and argued in a fair and impartial manner.

The question propounded is one about which theologians of all denominations generally differ, but it is answered in an able and lucid style. The one written by Rev. J. P. Adams in 1858 on "covetousness" ought to be republished.

The Duty of Churches to their Pastors, written in 1865

by Rev. Y. Jordan, gives us briefly a lesson that should be impressed upon every Church in the Association; and one of the best essays on that difficult subject, The Doctrine of Election, is handled in a masterly manner by Rev. J. A. Martin, a layman, in the year 1868.

The custom of writing these circular letters ceased in the year 1869, 18 years ago, the last one having been written by Franklin Gay, and in their place the time is consumed in public discussion of various topics of much interest and on reports of committees which attract large crowds of people eager to hear and learn something of the great work now in progress in the Christian world. The good order and decorum observed at these meetings and the adherence to strict parliamentary usages would surprise the American Senate and put to shame the noisy and boisterous Houses of the English Parliament.

The plan of organizing each successive year in the election of its officers by ballot and the mode of conducting their sessions is different from any other Christian body on the face of the globe. The rights of private members and the liberty reserved by the individual churches are striking characteristics of American freedom, and impress the bystander with the idea that Christ alone is the Head of the Church. The ministers are but the servants of the churches and the delegates are simply the annual representatives chosen by the members of each church.

For 67 years the Brier Creek Association has called together these Baptists of the mountain country to consult together about the great mission of our Savior to the earth, and devise plans to build up and extend his kingdom among men by the conversion of sinners and to aid in the final redemption of the world.

Having thus briefly outlined the history of this Association, we proceed now to give some biographical sketches of some of its principle members, some of those who have gone up to the promised land and some who are still lingering on the shores of time.

ITS MODERATORS.

1st. Rev. Thomas Masten was the first elected moderator in 1822, when the Association was organized. He served two years. He was a member of Brier Creek church and his remains lie in the church cemetery. He lived a long and useful life. He was pastor of his church as far back as 1802 and served several years.

2nd. William Dodson was chosen moderator in 1824, and served two years. He was a man of great force of character, and one of the leading ministers of his day. He was a Virginian by birth, and the uncle of that sainted missionary of the cross, Rev. Elias Dodson, who died a few years ago in the city of Wilmington, and who was so much loved throughout the entire State. The ashes of Elder Wm. Dodson are in the graveyard of Three Fork's church, in Alexander county. He lived to a ripe old age.

3rd. Rev. John Walker succeeded William Dodson, and served three years. His name appears often in the early records, and he must have been a man of extended usefulness, though the writer has no statistics of his general character.

4th. Thomas Douglas was the fourth moderator and served four years. He is said to have been an earnest and effective speaker, and was looked upon as one of the best men in his day. He was generally chosen to preach on stated occasions to large congregations. He lived to be quite old and died, I believe, in the county of Ashe where he had always lived.

5th. Smith Furgeson came in as the fifth moderator and served four years. The writer was well acquainted with this devoted Christian minister. We have rarely known a man of greater usefulness. He served his generation as a preacher for over half a century. His sermons were full of the gospel and delivered with so much simplicity and zeal as rarely to fail to excite his audience to tears.

Although like those mentioned before, without an education, he was well versed in the Scriptures, and his spotless character gave him great favor with the people. He lived to be very old, and died in Wilkes county, his native home, leaving a large circle of relatives and friends to follow after.

6th. Jesse Adams served as moderator thirteen years in succession and up to his death. He was a model minister, a good executive officer, and universally esteemed. He raised a large family, and three of his sons followed him in the ministry, W. F. and Z. B. and J. P., the latter still living. He died in the year 1849, in Wilkes county. Resolutions in regard to his death are found in the minutes of the next session. Although a man of little education, his pure life and zeal for the cause won the confidence of the world.

7th. Solomon D. Swaim succeeded Elder J. Adams and served for fifteen years. He was born, lived and died in Yadkin county, Febuary 23rd, 1865, being 57 years of age. He was ordained as a minister at Swaim's church in 1842 and was a successful preacher. He was an active and aggressive man and baptized many hundreds of people. He always exhibited the spirit of his Master and was as harmless as a dove. A large circle of relatives and friends are left to follow his shining light. We suppose the death of no man in this country was more universally regretted than Bro. Swaim's. He was called away in the very prime of his usefulness.

8th. J. A. Martin, a layman, now served as moderator for two years and made a good officer.

9th. Elder Thomas Howell served two years and was known as a good and zealous man.

10th. Elder W. F. Adams, one of the sons of the old moderator, (Jesse Adams) was chosen to preside over the body for 6 years, when failing health forced him to decline. He was pastor of old Brier Creek church for a period of thirty years. He was not only an acceptable preacher but a valuable citizen and neighbor. He lies buried at his own

residence in the Yadkin river valley in Wilkes county.

11th. Richard W. Wooten was elected in 1875, and served three years. Bro. Wooten gained the confidence of his brethren and is still a useful minister of the gospel and always present at the Associations, giving aid and counsel to his brethren.

12th. L. P. Gwaltney was chosen in 1878 and served for six years and declined to be re-elected, preferring a seat on the floor. He has since organized an Association composed of the churches of Alexander county in which he resides. This popular and much beloved minister of the gospel received but a partial education at Wake Forest College, and yet few ministers in the State surpass him in the use of the English language, or pulpit eloquence. Although comparatively a young man, he has gained an enviable reputation among his ministering brethren.

13th. Elder William Myres succeeded Elder Gwaltney in 1884 and still presides over the body. Brother Myres, though deprived of an education, by his indomitable energy and zeal for his Master, has large influence over the churches, and has succeeded in erecting new and comfortable church edifices wherever he is called as pastor. He is an active co-operator in every good work.

There were other ministers in this Association, besides the moderators, who deserve even more than a passing notice.

Rev. Wm. Pool, of Little River church, in Alexander county, was a member of this body. He died as he had always lived, with his armor bright. Four of his sons are ministers, James B., W. A., C. C. and Daniel W., all active, intelligent and prominent gospel workers and popular pastors, preaching the word with success.

Rev. S. P. Smith was for a long time a leading light in this body. His preaching was attended with power and hundreds were converted under his ministry. He left the Association during the excitement upon the mission and

temperance question and formed the Taylorsville Association and became its moderator. The Taylorsville at a later period became the Brushy Mountain, and Bro. Smith's church was attached to the Elkin. He was the first missionary officially appointed to ride and preach in the Brier Creek Association, aided by the Baptist State convention, and was the agent for several years of the Western convention, and was the first Baptist minister to preach in the old town of Morganton. He was a zealous advocate of education, missions and temperance, and when opposed, his convictions of right rendered him more bold and fearless. Like some of our other ministers he was at a later period of his life drawn into politics. In 1861, he was elected, with Dr. James Calloway, a member of the State convention in opposition to secession. In 1863 his friends run his name for Congress, but he would not enter the campaign. At the close of the war in 1865, he was chosen a member of the State convention to restore the State to the Union. He was elected to the Senate in 1868, and served with many other ministers who took part in that body. This closed his political aspirations. He had many ups and downs both in religious and political life, but remained firm and immovable in his convictions, and in the evening of his career his star set in calmness and repose. We have heard this man preach some of the most soul-stirring sermons to which we have ever listened. Though of limited education, his bearing and manner in the pulpit were attractive and commanding. He was annually elected pastor of the old Fishing Creek church for 48 years and served till his death.

Rev. William Garner, an uneducated man, preached for many years in the bounds of this Association and delighted more in baptizing the willing and happy candidate than any man we ever knew. Thousands were converted under his simple but earnest style of preaching the gospel. He would often compose his own songs to suit the occasion.

He died in Wilkes county and his aged companion still survives him.

Rev. W. G. Brown, known as "The Sweet Singer in Israel," has been a constant attendant on these meetings for a long number of years. He is an able expounder of the Scriptures and a popular pastor, for many years the moderator of the old Yadkin Association. Having no education he supplied himself with a selected library after he was called to the ministry, and by close application speaks the English language to perfection, and has really an elegant and beautiful style. To listen to his discourses one would take him to be a highly educated preacher. He has raised up three sons to be ministers. One, Judson, died in the State of Missouri where he was a leading spirit. Another, Sandford, a young man, has risen rapidly to the top of his profession and is now the secretary of the Missouri Baptist State Convention. Another, Solomon, is preaching in this his native State, well versed in doctrine.

We might continue these biographical sketches to great length, but we fear to encumber the pages of this little volume. This mountain country seems to have been peculiarly productive of Baptist preachers. By reference to one of the late minutes of this body, we see no less than thirty ordained ministers enrolled on its register. Education is encouraged, Sabbath schools are established, missions liberally sustained, and the cause of Christ built up in our waste places. Fountains of Scriptural and literary knowledged are opened up by these zealous Baptists of the old Brier Creek, "*which shall make glad the city of our God.*"

Other Associations have been formed out of its borders, new churches springing up each year, and a millennium dawn is visible in the horizon for these co-laborers of Christ. If this Association has done so much in the past, much more is expected to be done in the future. With her host of leaders and her army in the ranks, victory shall be

inscribe on her banners, and her captives numbered by the thousand! So mote it be.

THE CLERKS.

1st. Col. James Martin was elected clerk when the Association was organized on the 23rd day of November, 1822, and served continuously for twenty-five years. By careful examination of the minutes we find that he never failed to attend as clerk of the body till the day of his death. He was a man of great influence in Church and county, raised a large and highly respected family, and being a man of ample means he was liberal to the poor and a zealous friend to all benevolent institutions. The doors of his house were always open to the weary traveller, and a home for the preachers. He was one of the first advocates in this country for missions and education and aided in establishing Wake Forest College. He died suddenly in the midst of his usefulness in the 70th year of his age and was buried in Brier Creek churchyard in the valley of the Yadkin. His ancestors came from Virginia and settled along this valley and took an active part in the Revolution.

2nd. Rev. S. P. Smith succeeded Col. Martin in 1846 and served three years. We have before alluded to him as a preacher.

3rd. Elisha Feltz filled the office three years. He wrote a beautiful hand.

4th. Rev. W. F. Adams filled the office satisfactorily nine years, from 1852 to 1861.

5th. He was succeeded by J. A. Martin, a prominent and worthy layman.

6th. Rev. R. W. Wooten, two years afterwards was elected and served three years.

7th. Rev. I. N. Haynes was elected in 1865.

8th. Hix Hendren, next came in and served three years.

9th. In 1870, E. B. Hendren was elected and acceptably filled the office to 1874.

10th. Rev. E. N. Gwyn, was then chosen and for his peculiar clerical talent was called the "model Clerk." He still fills this important office, (1887.) He also rode throughout the bounds of the Association for some years, as agent and missionary for Sabbath schools and the building up of new churches, and his labors have been crowned with success. Whether as clerk, missionary, or pastor, his indefatigable energy never tires. He is an important factor in this large and intelligent body of Christians. He belongs to a highly intelligent Pedo-Baptist family, and was raised up in that faith. By reading and study he was converted to Baptist principles, and boldly, though humbly, entered their ranks and was ordained to the ministry.

The following is a list or names of ministers belonging to the Brier Creek Association in 1886, viz:

J. P. Adams, A. N. Barker, J. W. Burchett, C. C. Brown, W. Dowel, A. Gilreath, S. S. Goforth, A. Gooden, L. P. Gwaltney, J. P. Gwaltney, W. F. Gray, E. N. Gwyn, J. S. Forester, I. N. Haynes, I. Hollar, E. Hollar, J. N. Gregory, Y. Jordan, W. A. Myers, B. Mathews, J. H. Martin, T. W. Paris, D. W. Pool, S. F. Simmons, W. C. Segraves, R. W. Wooten, J. G. Weatherman, and Thos. Wright.

Last year (1887) twenty-six churches, with a membership of two thousand five hundred and eighty-five communicants, composed the body. We may add in conclusion, that while the churches, at their own option, unite in forming an Association they delegate to it no power over them, still reserving their independency, and acknowledging no supremacy but Christ, their living Head and Governor.

In taking our leave of collecting these materials for the future historian, we tender our gratitude to HIM for his goodness and mercy, and pray for His blessings upon the members of our beloved Association.

Centennial Address

At the 100th Anniversary of the

Brier Creek Church,

AUGUST 10th, 1883.

(ABBREVIATED.)

By Prof. J. H. Foote.

—o—

Having been requested a short time ago to deliver the Centennial Address before the Brier Creek Association, which holds its session here at old Brier Creek church to celebrate its birth of 100 years ago, I enter upon the task assigned me with little hope of interesting so large and intelligent an assembly. The subject I have chosen as appropriate for the occasion is "The Progress of Baptist Principles."

The study of the history and lives of our ancestors is certainly of great advantage. Who among us would not delight to hear of the good deeds and brave acts of our fathers? The child sits and listens with animation as his sire tells of the thrilling adventures and hair-breadth escapes of his forefathers, and some times their tragical end. And yet how wonderfully ignorant we are of our origin and whence we came. Many of us scarcely know even the names of our grand-fathers. But if this be true of our own biographies, it is no wonder we know so little of the rise and progress of our religious ancestors. I propose, briefly,

then, to trace their footsteps during the first centuries of the Christian era, and more especially to speak at length of their progress during the last 100 years.

Ecclesiastical, or church history, has employed the researches of the greatest scholars of the world. Our people read the ancient and modern histories of nations, and generally neglect to inform themselves about the history of the churches which succeeded those planted in the days of the Apostles, and which have existed through centuries of the fiercest persecutions and martyrdoms to the present time. Witnesses for the truth have lived and maintained the doctrine and ordinances of the churches which the inspired Apostles committed to their keeping through all ages.

For 1500 years that Man of Sin, Apostate Rome, has employed armies and crusades, inquisitions and tortures, prisons, famine and the stake to break in pieces the kingdom of Christ—the kingdom spoken of in the second chapter of Daniel, represented by a stone cut out of the mountain without hands, which should break into pieces the kingdoms of earth and eventually fill the world. But who is it that, for sixteen centuries, have alone fought with Antichrist—"the *scarlet harlot*, riding on the beast with ten horns, drunk with the blood of the saints?" Our brethren of other denominations can go back only to the Reformation to begin their history, while we, as Baptists, trace the footprints of our brethren as witnesses for Jesus through the dark ages of the past, hid among the Alpine rocks of Europe, or wandering through those mountains and deep forests where the caverns in which they were concealed from their enemies were made to echo their songs of praise to Him who "kept them as in the hollow of His hand." From the days of the Apostles down to the 19th century they "have kept the faith once delivered to the saints."

President Edwards says, "God was pleased to maintain an uninterrupted succession of witnesses throughout the whole Dark Ages, in Britain as well as in France and Germany, who held to the faith and practices of the Apostles." Dr. Davis, the Bishop of Monmouth, says: "The ancient Britons kept their Christianity pure, unmixed with human tradition, as they received it from the disciples of Christ, adhering strictly to the Word of God as their only rule of faith and practice."

By reference to the Historical Chart, published by A. S. Lyman, and who was not a Baptist, but an impartial writer, we form some idea of what it cost our brethren to hand down to us these sacred principles. He says that during the middle ages "Pope Gregory sent Augustine, with 40 monks, to the British isles, who wished to impose their creeds upon the saints, and who refusing to give up the right to worship God in their own way, after fasting and prayer for three whole days, 1200 of them were put to death in the most cruel manner!" Soon after this, says the same writer, "in the Council of Orleans, three men are burned to death for denying the sacrifice of the Mass;" "and that in the 12th century, during the time of Pope Innocent III, twelve hundred thousand of these innocent Christians were slain by the Inquisition!" And that for upwards of 300 years was a scene of bloody persecution, while one million five hundred thousand more were destroyed by the Papal Church!" Reinerius, the Inquisitor General, sent against the Waldenses A. D., 1240, says: "These sectarians are the most dangerous of all heretics. They have existed since the days of Pope Sylvester, A. D. 340, and some say since the days of the Apostles. They declare themselves to be the Apostles' successors, and hold ours to be the 'whore of Babylon.'" (See Rev., 17th ch.) This is what Reinerius said of our brethren. Cardinal Hosius, the learned defender of the Pope, and who presided at the Council of Trent, says, "That the doctrines of Luther and Calvin are nearly the same as the Waldenses held hundreds of years before their day." Tertullian and Origen, the greatest luminaries of the third century, say that "in the year 130 Lucius, the King of Wales, was baptized, and was the first king in the world to embrace Christianity."

Now, it is a historical fact these Christians, called by their different names of Waldenses, Albigenses, &c., held and practiced the very same principles and doctrines as the Baptists of the present day. They are our brethren, and firmly held the only true Church of Christ to be "*an assembly of baptized believers.*" On this account the Baptists may be considered the only Christian community which has stood since the days of the Apostles and preserved the pure doctrine of the Gospel during all the Dark Ages. We appeal, then, to the pages of history in which the most eminent scholars give the clearest proof, that not in one country

alone, but through the various kingdoms of the world, a succession of Baptist communities have come down to us. "all striped and scarred and blood-covered, a line of martyrs, slain by prison, by fire and by sword!" We hail these as the true and faithful witnesses of Jesus during all those fearful ages when the Man of Sin

"Sat upon the seven hills,
And from his throne of darkness ruled the world."

During the first three centuries we see the Baptists formed the only true evangelical society, and that during this time the Novatian Baptists established separate and independent churches, which have continued to the present time. The Oriental Baptist churches, with their successors. the Paulicians, continued in their purity till the 10th century, when they visited France, where they grew and spread till the army of the Crusades scattered them, or as we before stated, drowned over one million of these unoffending Christians in blood! But we have not time to more than briefly allude to these truths, astonishing as they may seem. Let us then approach nearer our own time and see how these principles have prevailed.

Dr. Mosheim, the distinguished German writer, in his History, volume 3rd, page 79, says: "In almost all the countries of Europe *an unspeakable number of Baptists preferred death in its worst forms to a retraction of their sentiments.* Neither the view of the flames that were kindled to consume them, nor the ignominy of the gibbet, nor the terrors of the sword could shake their invincible constancy or make them abandon tenets that appeared dearer to them than life and all its enjoyments." It is true, says this eminent and impartial author, "that many Baptists suffered death, not on account of their being rebellious subjects, but merely because *they were judged to be incurable heretics;* for in this century the error of limiting the *administration of baptism to adult persons only, and the practice of re-baptizing such as had received that ordinance in a state of infancy, were looked upon as most flagitious and intolerable heresies.*"

We look over into Protestant England in the year 1620, 263 years ago, and see that faithful Baptist minister, John Bunyan, shut up in Bedford jail for twelve long years for advocating these same principles, preaching from the iron bars of his dark prison to the multitudes gathered around

him. It was here and during his incarceration that he wrote that immortal little book, "The Pilgrim's Progress," which will ever remain a monument to his memory and a rich legacy to millions unborn, while the names of the monarchs who persecuted him will forever perish from the face of the earth.

Passing rapidly over the succession of Baptist churches in England and Wales, it is an established fact that a majority of the churches planted in America from 1645 to 1730 were organized by Welsh Baptists, and constituted on Articles of Faith brought over by them from the mother churches. To Dr. John Clarke belongs the honor of organizing the first Baptist church in America, in the year 1620, and not to Roger Williams as many have asserted.

But I wish to pause here, to present to this large and very attentive audience another view of this subject, as true as it is astonishing to many who hear me. It is this: That to the Baptists belong the honor of establishing CIVIL LIBERTY. Our form of church government planned the basis of American freedom, and has bequeathed both civil and religious liberty to one half the world, and is now rocking the other half to its centre, crumbling the thrones of its tyrants and arousing oppressed humanity to rise and assert its rights and overthrow its oppressors.

We appeal to Jefferson, the second President of the United States and the greatest statesman of America, a man of truth and benevolence, and not an infidel as some have slanderously asserted. Some eight years before the Revolution Mr. Jefferson was a regular attendant at the meetings of a small Baptist church in his vicinity, and having invited Andrew Tribble, its pastor, home to dine with him, Mr. T. asked him what he thought of their form of church government, who replied, "*that it had struck him with great force, and had interested him no little; that he had concluded that it would be the best plan of government for the American colonies.*" It is plain to be seen that his ideas of a free government which he obtained from attending Mr. Tribble's church flow, throughout that immortal instrument, the Constitution of the United States.

We appeal to Judge Story, Chief Justice, and the greatest jurist in America, who said: "To Roger Williams belongs the honor of establishing in this country a *code of laws* in which we read for the first time since Christianity ascended

the throne of the Cæsars, the declaration that *conscience should be free, and man allowed to worship his Creator as he believed his duty required him.*"

We appeal to Bancroft, the most eminent historian in America. He says that "Roger Williams, when but 30 years of age, had matured a doctrine which secures him immortality of fame, as its application has given religious peace to the American world."

We turn to the Old World—to Germany, the land of scholars and historians. Gervinus, the most astute historian of his age, says: "Roger Williams, having fled for his life from Massachusetts in 1636, founded the colony of Rhode Island. Here in his little State the fundamental principles of civil and religious liberty prevailed before they were taught in any of the schools of philosophy in Europe. From this little State they have extended throughout the United States. They have given laws to a continent, and lie at the bottom of all democratic movements which are now shaking the nations of Europe."

Coming down a little later, Patrick Henry, in Virginia, gave the final blow to the separation of the Church and State. The people were taxed to support the clergy of the Episcopal Church, and the taxes were collected just as they are now in this country. A circumstance occurred which brought to the front the great patriot of Virginia. The taxes were assessed for a certain amount of money per capita, or a certain number of pounds of tobacco, it being optional with the people which they would pay. The price of tobacco suddenly advanced; these preachers refused to take the money and demanded the tobacco. The people appealed to the courts. Patrick Henry, who now was scarcely known, appeared for the people, and by his thrilling eloquence drove the clergymen from their seats, and not only defeated their claim to the tobacco, but succeeded in breaking down that unjust and iniquitous statute, and forever abolished it; so that these clergymen had to depend upon their own characters for their support. The Baptists were now free. Patrick Henry, though not a Baptist, was their legal defender, and from the very first, as all historians agree, they united with him to a man in espousing the cause of the Revolution. Throughout the whole country, from Georgia to Massachusetts, they were everywhere publicly committed to the cause, beyond any other religious denom-

ination, and as such their houses of worship were destroyed wherever the British forces went. So we see "they practiced what they preached," and were ever ready to defend with their lives those principles of liberty bequeathed to them by their ancestors. We rejoice to know that these principles are more rapidly progressing in the last 100 years; they are silently at work permeating all countries of Europe, Asia and Africa. As they progress, side by side with them, the arts and sciences advance—the one is the promoter of the other. Before these principles were acknowledged, there was but little incentive to discovery and invention. Before that, 100 years ago, there was no railroad in this country, no steamboats, no telegraphs, no telephones, no Sabbath schools, and only now and then a meeting house. Why, when this church was organized 100 years ago, the "report" says with only eleven members—it was the only one in all the surrounding counties. What a change! Look at Catholic Spain and infidel France, where a little over 100 years ago our brethren were hunted down for the slaughter, and their Bibles stacked and burnt. Now our missionaries preach the everlasting gospel among them unmolested. In India where Judson gave up his life, there is now the largest church membership in the world, numbering some 14,000 communicants. In China, whose ports 100 years ago were shut up from the civilized world, our own Yates, the prince of missionaries, is now preaching and sending the Bible to her four hundred millions of benighted heathen.

In Italy the Pope, who for 1500 years pursued the Baptists with fire and sword, is shut up in the Vatican and is afraid "to show his head." Our beloved Taylor is preaching the name of Jesus in the Eternal City, where Peter was crucified, and where Paul "finished his course." In London, the metropolis of the world, Charles H. Spurgeon ranks as the highest pulpit orator of the globe. In Russia, in the isles of the sea, "from Greenland's icy mountain" to the burning sands of Africa, these ever blessed principles are spreading, ameliorating and Christianizing the unfortunate millions of our race. Who, then, may not feel proud to be numbered among the successors of "such a cloud of witnesses?" Who would feel ashamed to belong to the great Baptist family who hold up to the people of the nineteenth century such a glorious record?

In the year 1727, the first Baptist church was organized in North Carolina in Camden county at Shiloh, and remains to this day. In 1729 it numbered 132 members, one to every 312 population. When Brier Creek church was constituted, there were about 80 Baptist churches in the State with about 6,000 members. Ten years ago, according to the best information, there were 1,000 Baptist churches, and one-eighth of the whole population were Baptists. According to the illustrated Almanac, published this year by the editors of the Raleigh *News and Observer* newspaper, there were 214,082 Baptists in the State, while all the other denominations added together number 182,900, thus giving the Baptists a majority of 31,182 over all. But according to the estimate in the Baptist Almanac, we have a majority of 44,375 over all. In the United States there were only about 100,000 Baptists 100 years ago. To-day they number over 4,000,000.

Let us pause here and take a telescopic view of the next 100 years. If the advocates of these principles continue to increase in the same proportion, what a host of witnesses will celebrate the next centennial! Not one of us will be here of this large congregation to enjoy that magnificent gathering, but we may leave for them to behold *our* footprints by our works for the Master. Those immortal spirits that planted this church gaze down upon us to-day from the skies, while their mortal bodies have mouldered to dust in yonder churchyard, or scattered about in other localities. Let us emulate their deeds of love and cherish their memories. The Clevelands, the Bakers, the Gilliams, the Adams', the Martins, the Allens, and that devoted old pastor, Thomas Masten, have all gone to their reward, after long years of labor in their Master's vineyard.

My task is done. I have thus feebly and briefly traced the line of our ancestors through suffering and persecution, who have left in our hands these principles of sacred liberty to preserve and transmit to the latest generations, when there will be but "One Lord, one faith, one baptism." (Ephesians 4–5.)

"Better, though difficult, the right way to go,
Than wrong, though easy, where the end is woe."

THE BAPTISTS IN NORTH CAROLINA.

—o—

[Wilmington Star—Written by T. B. Kinsbury, D. D., One of the Editors.]

The first Baptist church in North Carolina was organized by the Rev. Paul Palmer, in 1727, in Camden county, and is still in existence. The first Baptist Association was that of Sandy Creek, formed in 1758, and composed of churches in the centre of the State. This was the third Association in the United States, the Philadelphia having been formed in 1707, and the Charleston in 1751.

The Baptist State convention, however, did not come into existence till 1830, at which time there were in the State fourteen Associations, two hundred and seventy-two churches and 15,360 members. On the 20th of March of that year, fourteen men, seven ministers and seven laymen, met in the town of Greenville, Pitt county, in the house of Dr. J. C. Gorham, and founded the institution which has proved a bond of union and an efficient source of development to the Baptists of the State. The constitution adopted by the convention, and a wise and masterly address commending it to the denomination, were written by the Rev. Thomas Meredith, founder of the *Biblical Recorder*, the Baptist organ of the State, and grandfather of the Rev. George Meredith Tolson, the present pastor of the Brooklyn Baptist church of this city.

This convention is not a legislative or a judicial body: it makes no laws, appoints no pastors, tries no cause involving doctrine or character; indeed, it exercises no control whatever over the churches and Associations it represents, except the moral right inherent in the objects it commends to their favor and support.

It is a voluntary assembly of the representatives of the churches to consider the general interests of the Kingdom of Christ; more especially home and foreign missions, Christian education and Sunday schools. The polity of the Baptist Church is peculiar. Each church is a sovereignty—an independent little republic—competent to manage its own affairs, and yet authorized to make no laws, but simply to administer the laws which Jesus Christ, the head of the Church, has Himself enacted for its government.

This sovereignty, it is claimed, is inherent in each church, and cannot be surrendered or waived, and yet for the promotion of the cause of religion it has been found wise for these independent churches to associate together and unite their efforts in extending the truth. Hence, contiguous churches form Associations; the churches of many Associations unite in State conventions, and these State conventions become constituent parts of a general convention, comprehending all the Southern States.

The Baptists were the first denomination to utilize the powers of the press; Thomas Meredith having established the *Biblical Recorder* in 1832, years before any other religious journal was published in the State. Wake Forest College was the first denominational college in the State, beginning operations in 1833, and the first Church Orphanage was that of the Baptists at Thomasville, which has now been in existence about a year.

Date Due

APR 22 '43			
MAR 7 '55			
MAY 24 '70			
APR 10			

Form 335—40M—6-39—S

Sch.R. 286 F688M 384880

School of Religion

Duke University Libraries
D02607349V